

MAN
SCHOOL
TO BE
and St
RCHD

H. C. Hartman's
Library.

No. 314.

Article 1 V of
on. Prepared
before



LIBRARY

of the

Theological Seminary

of the

Evangelical Lutheran Church

AT CHICAGO

MAYWOOD, ILLINOIS

Division _____

Class _____

Shelf _____

Ac. Vol. 18672

...to say
...they can do ev
...—follow the in
...and yet be pleasing in
...claiming to be me
...ning a right to, t
...Lord's tabl
...cursing.

born Luthe
these

...orce that produced the
...cessity of good
...ed, arose the Syn-

his errors
...vaga
...late
...to

...right
...ural ma
...rit of
...ne conf
...iled
...and Syn



rectly is recognized in
the General Synod. Your
tempt was wide of the mark in
question now is not the
tenth article teaching
theory? In your
are too timid to
eran view directly.
covertly, by asserting
proposition, that the
view which I state
caricature." And
under the

1. Because
that the whole
the Lord's Supper

2. Because the
objectively present

3. Because the words
received without faith.

. For your benefit I will
these points one by one.

1. The whole Christ
Who teaches this? The
He declares the nature
person of Christ as
Where one is the other
For information read the
mons on the Lord's

THE
CHRISTIAN
BOOK OF CONCORD,

OR
SYMBOLICAL BOOKS

OF
THE EVANGELICAL LUTHERAN CHURCH;

COMPRISING THE THREE CHIEF SYMBOLS, THE UNALTERED AUGSBURG CONFESSION, THE
APOLOGY, THE SMALCALK ARTICLES, LUTHER'S SMALLER AND LARGER CATE-
CHISMS, THE FORMULA OF CONCORD, AND AN APPENDIX.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED
AN HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED.

~~~~~  
TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN.  
~~~~~



NEWMARKET:

demanded co-operation
PUBLISHED BY SOLOMON D. HENKEL AND BRS.

1854.

EX LIBRIS



E. THEODORE BACHMANN

Entered according to Act of Congress, in the year 1854, by

S. D. HENKEL & BRS.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the
Western District of Virginia.

D. W., AND GEO. B. BENTLEY, PRINTERS.

PREFACE TO THE FIRST EDITION.

The Book of Concord, comprising the Symbols of the Evangelical Lutheran Church, has as yet enjoyed but a limited circulation in the United States. Wrapped in the obscurities of its original languages,—the Latin and German,—that venerable production of the Reformation has been left to slumber almost entirely in silence and neglect. Numerous causes have contributed to prolong this neglect. The descendants of German emigrants in America, have never cultivated the language and literature of their fathers with due interest; many of them are unable to read German; while many, able to read, and occupying elevated stations, have never manifested a laudable zeal for the doctrines of the church. The most obvious cause, however, seems to be, that the larger portion of Lutherans in America, are accustomed to read^t the English language only, and consequently have never had an opportunity to appreciate the value of their Symbols.

Yet, we cherish the anticipation of a brighter day in the Lutheran church. In a land of freedom, of science and art, where the generous spirit of political wisdom encourages the exercise of reason, and guards the decisions of conscience; where industry, energy, and enterprise, though daily attaining fresh prospects of future improvement, are continually unburying the sacred treasures of the past, we believe that the doctrines of our church will ultimately be reclaimed, and that men of our western clime will enter into the investigation of these doctrines with all the avidity natural to a love for the truth. That these doctrines and these principles of immutable truth, are congenial with the tastes and feelings of the American mind, we may fearlessly deduce from recent facts. Within the last few years, the Book of Concord and Luther's House-Sermons have been reprinted in this country; and several of Luther's works have lately been translated into the English language, and circulated extensively.

It was, therefore, reasonable to presume, that a faithful translation of the Book of Concord into the English language, was demanded by the necessities of the times, and would effectually co-operate with these laudable exertions. Partial translations indeed

of the Augsburg Confession had been made at different times; but it had never been fully rendered into English until 1831, when a translation was completed by the Rev. CHARLES HENKEL, assisted by Professor SCHMIDT, of Columbus Seminary, Ohio; and several small fragments from the Book of Concord, were subsequently translated by others.

At the urgent solicitation of many zealous members of the church, we announced, Oct. 9th, 1845, our resolution to procure a correct English version of the entire work, and publish it as soon as practicable. Since that period no time or labor has been spared to fulfil our promise.

We have had to engage the talents not only of men familiar with the Lutheran doctrine, as well as with the German and English languages, but, in consequence of the obsolete style in which the German copy of this work was originally written, we have constantly had recourse to men who were able to consult the Latin copy whenever it was requisite. And here we feel bound in justice to the industry and valuable abilities of those who contributed their friendly aid, to specify the several portions furnished by each.

The Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Smalcald Articles, the Appendix, and the Articles of Visitation,* in a version purely literal, were furnished by the Rev. AMBROSE and SOCRATES HENKEL. The Larger Catechism was translated, in the same manner, by the Rev. J. STIREWALT; the Epitome by the Rev. H. WETZEL; and the Declaration by the Rev. J. R. MOSER. The Smaller Catechism was copied mainly from the translation by the Rev. DAVID HENKEL, published in 1827. Much assistance in reviewing the proof-sheets throughout the publication of the work, was rendered by JOSEPH SALYARDS, Principal of the Newmarket Academy, who has long cultivated the study of science and general literature; and he likewise furnished translations of all the Prefaces, from the Latin, and of the Historical Introduction, from the German.

All these translations when collected, were carefully compared with the original by the Rev. AMBROSE HENKEL, and afterwards, with the exception of the Historical Introduction and the Prefaces, were revised, transcribed, and prepared for the press by the Rev. SOCRATES HENKEL. We have derived considerable assistance, too, in the progress of the work, from the Rev. L. EICHELBERGER.

The principal translations were made from the German edition of 1790, published at Leipsic; and, being favored by the

* These Articles, inasmuch as they do not occur in the original edition of the Book of Concord, published in 1580, and do not constitute an integral part of it, but were subsequently drawn up in 1592, have been omitted in the second edition.

Rev. C. P. KRAUTH, with a copy of the original German Dresden edition of 1580, we were enabled to compare them with that also. The Latin copy, to which uniform reference was made in comparing the translations, was that published by HASE in 1846; and from this the Prefaces were all translated. Whenever the German copy presented insuperable obscurities, recourse was also had to this edition in numerous passages. The Appendix was taken from the German and Latin edition published by MÜLLER, printed at Stuttgard, 1848, from which the Historical Introduction was also translated.

Deeming it most compatible with the nature of the work,—the subjects being chiefly of a didactic and doctrinal character,—we have endeavored throughout to preserve as just and uniform a medium as possible, between a translation purely literal, and one which admits all the freedom and elegance of English composition. We have labored to be faithful, and yet not to offend the fastidious ear. We have been anxious to preserve the serious tone and spirit of the pious original. But, as imperfection is the fate of all human efforts, the candid reader will no doubt discover many inaccuracies. Any friendly suggestion, therefore, pointing out such defects, will be received with gratitude, and enable us to render a second edition more worthy of an intelligent public.

May our labors be the instrument, in the hands of Providence, for promoting an acquaintance with the Book of Concord, the *norm* of all genuine Lutherans since 1580, and for extending the doctrines taught by the illustrious Reformer!

THE PUBLISHERS.

NEWMARKET, *Shenandoah, Va.*,
July 4th, 1851.

PREFACE TO THE SECOND EDITION.

In presenting the second edition of the Book of Concord in the English language, the publishers take pleasure in announcing that the whole work has again been carefully revised and compared with the original text. The first edition, though containing many imperfections, met nevertheless with a kind reception in the church; which induced the publishers to use every effort that seemed necessary to bring the work to greater perfection. Accordingly, before

publishing a second edition, the talents of individuals, known as literary men and prominent theologians in the church, were engaged, who were requested to revise the work, comparing it with the original, not changing however the language of the first edition more than would be found necessary to render it a good translation; and to these gentlemen sincere acknowledgments are due for a vast number of valuable suggestions.

The Augsburg Confession was revised by Rev. C. P. KRAUTH, D. D., Professor in the Theological Seminary, Gettysburg, Pa.; the Apology, by Rev. W. F. LEHMANN, Professor of Theology, Columbus, Ohio; the Smalcald Articles, by Rev. WM. M. REYNOLDS, D. D., President of Capital University, Ohio; Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms, by Rev. J. G. MORRIS, D. D., Baltimore, Md.; and the Formula of Concord and Catalogue of Testimonies, by Rev. C. F. SCHAEFFER, D. D., Easton, Pa. The Historical Introduction was also carefully compared and revised by the original translator; and every attention was given by the publishers to have the corrections faithfully attended to: thus they feel confident, that the English translation of the Book of Concord will meet that encouragement from the church, which her Symbols originally received.

NEWMARKET, *Sh. Va.*,
July 4th, 1854.

CONTENTS.

HISTORICAL INTRODUCTION, - - - - -	page ix
MANDATE OF CHRISTIAN II., - - - - -	87
PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF CONCORD, - - - - -	89
THE THREE CHIEF SYMBOLS, - - - - -	
I. THE APOSTOLICAL CONFESSION OR SYMBOL, - - - - -	101
II. THE NICENE CONFESSION OR SYMBOL - - - - -	"
III. THE ATHANASIAN CONFESSION, - - - - -	102
THE UNALTERED AUGSBURG CONFESSION, - - - - -	
ADDRESS TO THE EMPEROR, CHARLES V., - - - - -	107
ARTICLES OF FAITH AND DOCTRINE, - - - - -	109
Article I. Of God, - - - - -	109
" II. Of Original Sin - - - - -	"
" III. Of the Son of God, - - - - -	110
" IV. Of Justification, - - - - -	"
" V. Of the Ministry, - - - - -	"
" VI. Of New Obedience - - - - -	111
" VII. Of the Church, - - - - -	"
" VIII. What the Church is, - - - - -	"
" IX. Of Baptism, - - - - -	112
" X. Of the Lord's Supper, - - - - -	"
" XI. Of Confession, - - - - -	"
" XII. Of Repentance, - - - - -	"
Art. XIII. Use of the Sacraments, - - - - -	113
" XIV. Of Church Government, - - - - -	"
" XV. Of Church Rites and Ordinances, - - - - -	"
" XVI. Of Civil Polity and Government, - - - - -	"
" XVII. Of Christ's Return to Judgment, - - - - -	114
" XVIII. Of Freewill, - - - - -	"
" XIX. Of the Cause of Sin, - - - - -	115
" XX. Of Faith and Good Works, - - - - -	"
" XXI. Of the Worship of Saints, - - - - -	118
ARTICLES CONCERNING WHICH THERE IS DISSENSION, AND IN WHICH ARE RELATED THE ABUSES WHICH HAVE BEEN CORRECTED, - - - - -	
Art. XXII. Of Both Elements in the Eucharist, - - - - -	119
" XXIII. Of the Marriage of Priests, - - - - -	120
" XXIV. Of the Mass, - - - - -	122
Art. XXV. Of Confession, - - - - -	125
" XXVI. Of Diversity of Meats, - - - - -	126
" XXVII. Of Monastic Vows, - - - - -	129
" XXVIII. Of the Power of the Bishops or Clergy, - - - - -	133
APOLOGY OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, - - - - -	
I. Concerning Original Sin, - - - - -	145
II. Of Justification, - - - - -	156
III. Of Love and the Fulfilment of the Law, - - - - -	180
IV. Of the Church, - - - - -	215
V. Of Repentance, - - - - -	230
VI. Of Confession and Expiation, - - - - -	248
VII. Of the Sacraments and their Proper Use, - - - - -	264
VIII. Of Human Ordinances in the Church, - - - - -	268
IX. Of the Invocation of Saints, - - - - -	285
X. Of Both Elements in the Lord's Supper, - - - - -	294
XI. Of the Marriage of Priests, - - - - -	297
XII. Of the Mass, - - - - -	310
XIII. Of Monastic Vows, - - - - -	330
XIV. Of Ecclesiastical Power, - - - - -	345
THE SMALCALD ARTICLES, - - - - -	
PART I. ARTICLES CONCERNING THE DIVINE MAJESTY, - - - - -	366
PART II. ARTICLES WHICH CONCERN THE OFFICE AND WORK OF JESUS CHRIST, OR OUR REDEMPTION, - - - - -	366
Art. I. The Chief Article, - - - - -	366
" II. Of the Mass, - - - - -	367
Art. III. Of Convents, &c., - - - - -	372
" IV. Of Popery, - - - - -	"

determinate sign by which they were recognized. After the introduction of the remaining significations, he says: "I supposed it preferable to derive the signification of this word from the Pagan rites, in which certain tokens or signs were delivered to those who were admitted to the more secret ceremonies, unintelligible to the greater part of the superstitious populace; and these signs they called *Symbols*, which being exhibited and mutually recognized, they were admitted without scruple to the recesses and the secret rites of that god, whose Symbols they had received." Rufinus, however, claims for the word a still wider application, and he says, (from a fondness for the tradition that the Apostolic Symbol was composed entirely by the contributions of the Apostles,) that Symbol is a Greek word, and may signify a collection or composition, that is, the result of many efforts. We shall only add here, that this explanation depends entirely upon an ungrammatical interchange of the words *συμβολον* and *συμβολε*. The term *Symbolus* has been employed also by Plautus, in the sense of an image impressed in wax; and it occurs also in this form, in the first book of the *Cestial and Happy*, written against Elipandus, concerning the Apostolic Symbol, where the Symbol of Constantinople is falsely characterized as the *Symbolus* of Ephesian faith.

The time when the word *Symbol* came into general use, in the sense of Confession of Faith, and especially of Apostolic faith, John Benedict Carpzay will not place earlier than the Council of Nice; and indeed, before that time, we find the word very seldom employed by the Fathers of the church, while in the first centuries the appellation, *Canon*, rule of the church, of faith, of truth,—the gospel of the holy Apostolic faith,—the exposition or definition of faith,—the science, the treatise, the inscription,—a brief repetition of the chief principles of faith,—the treasure of life,—the ecclesiastical confession,—the tower of faith, were quite usual; yet here it must be very carefully observed, that these appellations apply equally well to the explanation of the Confession of Faith,—that body of instruction which was to be imparted to the catechumen. On the contrary, Vossius discovers proof of an earlier use of the word, from the fact, that Rufinus selects it in the title of his work,—the Exposition of the Apostolic Symbol,—and appeals besides to his predecessors: "They desire to call this a Symbol for many and very adequate reasons." It is known besides, that this term was first employed by Cyprian, about the middle of the third century, and from that time was always applied as an expression for the confession of faith by the church, generally at first, and at last exclusively.

This term was introduced into the Evangelical church by Dr. Luther in his writings: "The three *Symbols*, or Confession of the faith in Christ, unanimously employed in the church, 1538." We likewise find it used by Melancthon in his "System of Doctrine;" even earlier indeed in the oath prescribed for the Doctors of Divinity, by the new statutes of the university of Wittenburg, 1533. The preface to his *Corpus Julium* designates the Augsburg Confession by this name: "The articles of which Confession serve at this time as a correct, beautiful, pure, and invincible *Symbol* of the reformed churches." And not only the preface to the Book of Concord designates the same writing next to "the old, acknowledged Symbols," "A Symbol of Faith likewise," but the Formula of Concord also, in the Epitome, section 4. and the Declaration, section 2. distinguishes it by the same

expression; and we learn here especially on the next page, what idea the Evangelical church connected with that term. For it is here expressed with distinctness, that these Symbols are no private writings, but books, written, approved, and received, in the name of the churches which confess one doctrine and religion; just as in the Formula of Concord, Part II., after an enumeration of the chief subjects of the Book of Concord,—the Augsburg Confession, the Apology, the Articles of Smalcald, and the two Catechisms of Luther,—they are denominated “public and approved writings,” and thus they are placed by the side of the old, acknowledged Symbols, as an enlargement and extension of them. Now here the general custom is manifest,—by the term *Symbol*, the Confession of Faith is expressed with comprehensive brevity, as confession-formal; by the term *Symbolic Writing* or *Book*, is implied the fuller explanation, establishment, and decision of the system of doctrine in the church.

2. Symbols have arisen simultaneously with the church. The Lord, indeed, has not established his church upon Symbols, but upon his own Word. From this the church derives her confessions, as evidences how she understands and explains the divine Word. From the iniquity of man it could not fail, that contradictory opinions should arise in the church herself, and proceed from external controversy to internal disquietude, because the church, in her temporal condition, has false Christians and hypocrites in her midst; she was soon obliged, therefore, to establish Symbols for the purpose of giving evidence of her faith, of refuting false accusations, and of rejecting pernicious errors, and in accommodation to the progress of time, to institute new Symbols, without rejecting the old, not for the purpose of establishing new doctrines, but for the purpose of acknowledging anew the old Symbols,—those truths derived from the Fathers,—and of providing them with new defences against encroaching errors. This origin of the Symbols of the church will fully manifest itself from what follows. The simple form of Baptism extended at the same time with the church, in the Apostolic Symbol, to a confession of Baptism: this to the Nicene Confession, comprising only a few more propositions, and according to the necessities of the times in reference to the demands of the faith, to the Athanasian, more copiously developed and accurately defined. From that time the church, on the one hand, found no external occasion for a new declaration of her faith; on the other, still less did she find it an internal duty. But when she began to reflect on these things, she discovered that human innovations in the church were the real sources of her difficulties, (Augsburg Confession, Art. 26, &c.,) and recovering herself from these difficulties, she began to purify and re-establish herself, and to perceive that it was her first and most important duty, to acknowledge her faith and her doctrine publicly; here, according to the demands of the time, arose her extended, new confessions, all which partly referred back to the first Symbols, as the basis of an attachment superadded, partly extending the structure further towards its completion, the foundation of which was derived from the Word of God. Thus every Symbol took the impressions of the time, and of the historic circumstances out of which it grew: and each affords not only a general, but even a specific, account of the reasons for its establishment.

3. But these reasons determine the *Design* also of Symbols and Symbolic Writings. If, according to 1 Pet. 3. 15, every member of the church of ma-

ture age, is to be considered in a condition to testify his faith, and to answer every man, this Apostolic requisition is incumbent on the church, as the community of believers, in a still higher degree. And indeed she has to fulfil this duty externally as well as internally. Externally, the power of the Holy Ghost, through the confessions of the church, chastises the unbelief and the errors of the world; but internally, the members of the church are instructed, secured, and advanced. This is rendered evident by the Formula of Concord itself, claiming a double design for church symbols, "That they not only promote a pure and salutary doctrine, but subject all who teach a different doctrine, to their due reprehension;" and afterwards again this double design in a single Symbol is referred to, in the Formula of Concord, Part I., and in Part II. But one of these designs without the other cannot appear in every instance; the purity of Faith cannot be proved and secured, without at the same time referring to erroneous opinions, in which the human mind continually falls, if a man believes that he possesses in his own bosom the light and the fountain of understanding, or attempts to explain the Word of God according to his own conceptions. For if, indeed, the Symbols, according to their first design, were "testimonies and explanations of faith," they would serve none the less on that account for the preservation of faith, but transmit it pure and unadulterated down to posterity. (Augs. Conf. Art. 21: "This is about the substance of the doctrine," &c.) But purity of faith without pure doctrine cannot subsist; the church then must naturally above all things refer her teachers to her Symbols, and make it their duty to adhere faithfully and sincerely to them in doctrine. The primary duty of self-preservation requires this. For if the church would allow those persons, whom she has intrusted with the office of teaching, and to whom she has given her own authority to exercise this office, to teach according to their own opinions, even what militates against the ecclesiastical system of doctrine, she would thus give them power to labor for her own destruction. Hence this enjoins upon the church a necessary solicitude for the salvation of her adherents. She must, however, be convinced, that the pure doctrines of the Word of God are contained in her acknowledged and established Symbols. Without this conviction, she cannot maintain them a moment. But by virtue of this conviction, she must not suffer any thing publicly to be taught in her midst, that militates against her religious tenets, rendering them dubious, assailing and subverting the very foundation of her faith, when in this way she sees the salvation of her members endangered. This, however, we shall more fully expose hereafter.

4. From their Design, naturally results the Necessity of Symbols and Symbolic Writings drawn up in form, and their relation to the holy Scriptures. The church has sufficiently explained herself in reference to this matter in the preface to the Book of Concord, where she not only testifies, "that it was never her design, by this formula of reconciliation, to molest and endanger the pious, who are already suffering tyranny and persecution," but she also declares, a little afterwards: "For it seemed most indispensably necessary, that a pious exposition and arrangement of all those controverted points, deduced from the Word of God, should appear in the midst of so many rising errors in our times as well as so many offences, contentions, and perpetual broils, in order that according to its principles, the pure doctrine might be distinguished and separated from the false. This design will more-

over effect this result, that turbulent and contentious men will not be free in proportion to their inclination, to excite controversies inseparable from offence, nor, as they do not suffer themselves to be attached to any formula of pure doctrine, to propose and propagate egregious errors. For from this it will follow at last, that the pure doctrine will be vitiated and lost, and nothing be transmitted to posterity but doubtful opinions and academical restrictions. To this may be added what we know to be due from us in this way, to ourselves and to our subjects, in consequence of the duty which God has enjoined upon us, that we carefully regard what may relate to purposes of this life and of that which is to come, and labor to provide with great zeal, as far indeed as it can be done, what may contribute to the extension of the name and glory of God, to the propagation of his Word, from which alone salvation may be expected, to the peace and tranquillity of churches and schools, and to the general composure and consolation of agitated minds."

The necessity of Symbols is consequently not so much absolute and unconditional, as hypothetical and contingent. The revealed Word of God alone is absolutely necessary for the preservation of the church, and for the salvation of souls. "This is the only rule and standard (Epitome, Compendious Rule, No. 1) according to which all doctrines and teachers alike ought to be tried and judged. Other writings, however, of ancient and modern teachers, whatever their reputation may be, shall not be held to be of equal authority with the holy Scripture, but to be subordinate to it, and shall not be received otherwise or further than as witnesses." And who may say that no condition of the church can be thought of, in which it may enjoy a happy perpetuity, not indeed without evidences and confessions, but without Symbolic Writings, in the sense in which we use the term? But a conditional, casual necessity must ever be added to the Symbols, not through internal, but from external circumstances, not through the existence, but from the condition of the church at the time. They are always necessary, and their preservation is enjoined upon us by the fact, that the church can never remain unassailed in the possession of divine truth (1 Cor. 11, 18; Gal. 1, 6; 1 Tim. 4, 1), but she must be continually on her guard, that no erroneous doctrine, under the guise of truth, be intruded. For teachers of error refer also to the Scripture, and seek their arguments out of it, in order to justify their opinions; and hence it becomes necessary for the church to prove the system of pure doctrine from the Scripture—to expose that which is no system indeed, and will never produce any—laying it down, establishing it, and maintaining it rightly in the public confessions of her faith. This she must do, in order to exhibit the conformity of her peculiar doctrines with the Scriptures, to direct her members to a correct interpretation of the Word of God, and to provide them a shelter against erroneous opinions.

But let us examine another argument which loudly pleads the necessity of Symbols, in our sense. This argument must naturally have relation to the minister of the church. Whoever feels a holy solicitude to discharge the indispensable duties of his office, must surely experience a secret joy on reflecting, that the church has committed to him her normal rules of instruction, according to which he can regulate the performance of his duties. He is bound in all respects, and in preference to every thing else, to observe the precepts of the Word of God, as to what he should preach. If he is

possessed of a delicate conscience, he will not be satisfied by being convinced in his own mind, of having properly comprehended the doctrine of the Scripture. For, on the one hand, he must always be conscious of his own fallibility, and consequently have great reason to distrust his own penetration; while, on the other hand, he must know, that he labors in the service of the church, through which the Lord has given him a charge, "to minister to the household of God"—that he is not a lord over the faith of his followers, but "a fellow-laborer and a servant." Consequently he can then only discharge the functions of his office with inward joy, when he possesses a commission from the church, together with her determinate and acknowledged system of doctrines, from which he can be assured, that his own peculiar views of the doctrines of the holy Scripture, will be found to coincide with the Confession of the church. Hence it will always follow, that he will find himself in the right then only, when he can assume, in his discourses, with good reason, the authority of the church. For as the Symbols of the church can maintain their authority, solely because they conform in their principles with the Word of God, so the minister, in discharging the functions of his office, can secure the confidence of his congregation only in proportion to his fidelity to the Confession of the church; whilst, in return, the same relation affords him abundant protection against every impertinent demand, requiring him to accommodate his instructions to the fluctuating opinions of men, which may have found encouragement from those among whom he labors.

5. After this it still remains for us to determine how we are to estimate the Authority of church symbols. There is an intimate relation between their authority and their necessity. We might well permit this to speak for itself, while we, however, may refer to the discussion in section 4, in reference to their relation to the holy Scriptures, merely adding the following remark. In the Formula of Concord, Part II., preface, the Augsburg Confession is called, "A pure Christian Symbol," to which, at the present time, true Christians should be found adhering next to the Word of God; and several pages further on, it is said in reference to the entire Symbolic value: "These general, public writings have always been viewed by all pious men in the pure churches and schools, as a compendious outline or form of salutary doctrine . . . in the very manner, indeed, which Dr. Luther himself recommended to us, by way of pious and necessary advice; and with great perspicuity, he draws this distinction, that the Word of God alone should ever remain, the only guide and rule in all doctrine, to which no human writings should be regarded as equal, and should be held in subserviency to it."

This authority which Symbols of the church claim for themselves, results from no unconditional excellence, but depends entirely on contingent circumstances. It rests upon the authority of the Word of God, and upon their conformity with the Scriptures. The Symbols by no means pretend to elevate themselves above the holy Scriptures, or to be equal to them; but in all simplicity they arrange themselves under the Scriptures, look up to them for every supply, as the glass does to the fountain from which it is filled. Independent of, or in opposition to, the Word of God, they are nothing. But this only the church desires, that the conformity of her Symbols of doctrine with the purity of Scripture, be acknowledged by those,

who wish to be connected with her, and to share the advantages of her society.

Not that she would by the force of Symbols, impair the freedom of faith and conscience among her members, but she wishes to guard that freedom in the proper manner. For she forces no one to subscribe to her doctrines, against his own internal convictions, and she can never have a considerate adherent, who is unable to make her Confession his own. With this view, however, the church cannot construct her Symbols on so broad a basis, that for each private opinion, even on the smallest point of Christian belief, there might be full scope and latitude; but she must speak out with precision, what she believes, and what she does not believe; what doctrine she adopts as founded upon the Word of God, and what doctrine she rejects, from the same authority. Were she to act otherwise, she would make herself the receptacle of every heresy, and be guilty of her own destruction, (Formula of Concord, Part II., preface.)

But the important question is this: Are the doctrines of the Scripture contained in the Symbols; is the Confession of these Symbols the true exponent of divine, revealed Truth, or not? With this question they must stand or fall; and just as they themselves, in consequence of their conformity with the Scriptures demand a recognition, so opponents must be satisfied, that we demand proof for the contrary, setting aside all frivolous phrases about systems of Symbols, compulsion of Symbols, compunction of conscience, spiritual fetters, paper Popery, &c. "Were our Symbols, from the old, venerable Apostolic, to the unexcelled Formula of Concord, especially in the Epitome, ever refuted from the Word of God, with clearness and precision! Has an error in doctrine been pointed out in them, with the color of truth?" We have searched with all possible diligence for something of this kind, but we have found nothing, and we are emboldened to challenge any opponent, who charges our Symbols with being independent authorities of faith, wishing to exalt themselves even above the holy Scriptures, to furnish only a single reference in proof of his charge. We assume for our Symbols no claim of divine inspiration,—as they do not term themselves "divine writings,"—we claim no divine authority, but merely an ecclesiastical authority, and we give them no preference above other Christian writings, except as expressing the authority of the church. We exult not in the vain boast that there cannot be found here and there some historical, literary, or other error in the formalities of expression; but this can never prove injurious to their authority, for that authority depends not upon these secondary, but upon far more important, considerations, more especially upon those considerations which relate to a soul-saving faith; "Our Symbolical Books are chargeable with no essential errors, and they continually agree with the doctrines of the holy Scriptures."

A further objection has been urged against the authority of church Symbols, that the free exercise of opinion, and consequently the church itself, or the efficiency of the Holy Ghost in the church, is limited by them, as by an infallible rule of doctrine. But who can be so ignorant as to mean, that the operative power of the Holy Ghost can be diminished or impaired by the feeble institutions of men? Should it please the Lord only to reveal a new path to salvation, and to erect his church on a foundation different from that upon which it has hitherto been standing, who would then dare to re-

sist him, and say, "So far shalt thou go and no farther!" But, we are well assured that the foundation upon which the church stands, is impregnable and eternal; that we are living in the latter times, when we are not to expect a new revelation. (Eph. 2, 20; 1 Cor. 3, 10; Gal. 1, 8; Luke 16, 29; Rev. 14, 6.) Indeed those who pronounce the authority of Symbols an obstacle to a free developement of doctrine, expect another revelation, not from the Spirit of God, but from their own spirit; for this they demand the liberty to frame a religion which may adapt itself to all the temporary fluctuations of their natural convictions. Not only the Symbols do they treat in this manner; still more do they act in opposition to the Word of God. They do not wish to expand their own comprehension, and explain the divine manifestation of doctrine, but to set up a new, self-conceived doctrine in its stead; and thus it would come to pass, that, though they might be in the right, soon there would no longer be found one undivided system of faith, but as many systems as there are individuals.

But in this way the church itself would soon cease to exist. Therefore, to secure a necessary union, she has established Symbols. Yet she ascribes eternal authority not to these, but to the Word of God alone. Hence, delivering her Confession to the Diet at Augsburg, "as an evidence of her faith and of her doctrines," she says, "If any one should be found who has an objection to them, we are ready to give him further information, with reasons from Holy Writ," Augs. Conf., Conclusion. In the preface to the Formula of Concord she confesses again: "We embrace also that original and unaltered Confession; and we do this, not because it was written by *our* theologians, but because it is drawn from the Word of God, . . . as the Symbol of our day;" likewise also in the preface to the Book of Concord: "As an evidence and expression of the faith of those who were living at the time, how they understood and explained the Scriptures, and how they refuted the doctrines opposed to them." And Luther himself says in reference to the Augsburg Confession, "We shall hold on to it, until the Holy Ghost shall give us a better one." The church then does not wish to ascribe to her Symbols immutable authority; she admits that some one might discover a defect in them; she finds them merely a temporary expression of her faith; she reserves to herself expressly the privilege of improving them, of completing, or of extending, as occasional necessity may require. But she would not here be understood as speaking in reference to the doctrines they contain, or in reference to the principles, but merely of the form and phraseology under which those doctrines are brought before the public eye. But she does not encourage the opinion, that a time will or may come, when the *Faith* which she professes, must be abandoned, as false, or as insufficient for salvation. She every where avows her resolution to hold fast this faith, and therefore, through divine permission, she will resolutely maintain the divine truth once acknowledged and delivered at Augsburg, 1530.

Every step of progress upon the foundation of this faith, every thing that can contribute to a better explanation and defence of it, to a clearer manifestation of its truth, to a more effectual resistance of the errors arrayed against it, she accepts with gratitude as a rich acquisition, as an evidence of the lasting operation of the Holy Ghost in the congregation of Christ; but an explanation of doctrine, by which the doctrine itself would be changed

or abolished, she utterly denounces. To an enlargement of the structure, by which the pillar and the very basis of truth would be removed, 1 Tim. 3. 15, even indeed undermined, she extends not her hand. Her superstructure of doctrine is reared; it rests upon an immovable foundation; and we now welcome every one who wishes to dwell harmoniously with her in this edifice, and who contributes something in her own way to its security, its defence, or its beauty.

But this objection also will be made against the lasting value of church Symbols: Will not deplorable divisions among Christians be, as it were, perpetuated, and that union of the separate Confessions so earnestly desired, especially of the Lutheran and Reformed churches, ultimately prevented? *Wasserschleben* is altogether right in the assertion, that the Symbolical Books hitherto existing, are totally incompatible with any such union: for separations and condemnations must necessarily lose their significance, if the separate divisions unite themselves again; and he is right when, in opposition to Dr. Ribbeck, he says: "How can this author maintain, that there will be no longer a Lutheran or a Reformed member, and still hold fast to the principles of both, to the separate Symbolical Books of both? Have these lost their peculiarity, their exclusive character, distinguishing them from each other in their confessions, presenting doctrinal distinctions entirely unessential? Then indeed there can be no obstacle to a union internal and true."

We confess that any one bears the Christian name unmerited, who does not at this day from the bottom of his heart desire this true internal union of the separate Confessions: indeed we are convinced, from John 10, 16, that the Lord in due time will bring about this desirable union in the church. But he only can effect it. If men form a union; if especially the civil authorities take this object in hand, evil results must necessarily follow, Acts 5. 38; as we may readily learn by examining the history of our time, that such a union as does not satisfactorily reconcile existing contradictions, but only covers them over, will really be no union at all in spirit, and therefore it can possess no durability, but will only create mischievous schisms. This is the primary evil of all recent attempts at union:—that men will repose, with religious indifference, more or less, on the strength of their alliances, without which the effort would never come to a conclusion: that in view of historic truth, from which they might always derive invaluable benefits, they shut their eyes and say, no differences exist; they anticipate the natural course of things, and only cause commotions; they draw the church out of the path pointed out by the Lord, and introduce her into one constructed by men, which therefore can never lead her to her proper destiny. What benefit is it to say, "there is no contradiction any longer," if contradictions still exist? to say, "they are subdued," when they are prevailing all around? Let us observe these differences closely, and learn to interpret their meaning; let us pay due attention to history, and form a correct estimate of every confession; for by union-making no advantage can be gained, but each party must lose. And there should be a proper reference not only to the incongruities of confessions, but their correspondence also. Whoever regards both sides in the genuine spirit of wisdom, love, and truth, will most effectually contribute to hasten and promote an ultimate union in spirit and in truth.

6. The Authority of church Symbols gives them also their Binding Force, especially in relation to those who perform the official duties of the church.

If the church must already make a conformity with her ideas of doctrine laid down in her Symbols, a condition under which alone she can grant admission to her communion, she must naturally desire this conformity more definitely still of those who wish to become her servants. In section third we have alluded to the reasons for this desire. We have here yet to add that which is necessary in reference to the requisite obligation imposed by church Symbols, which connects itself with this matter.

We maintain that the church will generally be in the right, if she requires her ministers to acknowledge the authority of her Symbols, and declare themselves unequivocal supporters of these Symbols. It is unimportant whether this be done by formal oath, by the union of hands, by a written obligation, or by verbal stipulation; for of those, who wish to become her servants, as the ministers of truth, the church may suppose that she is dealing with honest men. Now the *form* of this declaration, indeed, may seem indifferent, yet this is not the case with the purport of the terms employed; for they should definitely and clearly express that in which the church is interested.—the acknowledgment of the conformity of her Symbols with the Scriptures, in every thing relating to opinion: and this declaration is made, not merely indeed to acknowledge this conformity, but because they wish to regulate themselves faithfully in doctrine according to the Symbols. This requisition can be assented to only by one who feels internally convinced that the church Symbols are adequate expressions of the doctrines of the Scripture, that they have grown out of the Word of God, and conform in all essential points with it. If these convictions exist, the obligation imposed by the Symbols is neither a fetter to the spirit, nor a burden to the conscience; if they do not exist, then the question naturally cannot be about an obligation, nor about the admission to an office in the church. For the church has not only the right, but it is also her duty, to investigate the religious convictions of every member, who wishes to become her servant. She must, so far as it is possible, probe his conscience, in order to determine whether he will be for her, or against her; whether he will gather with her, or scatter abroad. It is indeed more than natural to desire an office in the church, and, at the same time, freedom and privilege, not only to preach a different doctrine from that which the church professes, under its authority and power, but also to dare (for this is a necessary consequence) to war against the doctrines of the church, to represent them as false, and finally to pervert them entirely. Whoever assumes an office, be it in the state or in the church, assumes the additional obligation of discharging the necessary duties of that office, together with the surrender of a portion of his personal liberty. He acts in a capacity of self-subjection. Indeed an unlimited, abstract state of freedom in social connection with other men, independent of any social obligation, is utterly impossible.

But some one may say, that the obligation imposed by Symbols makes hypocrites, without being of any advantage to the whole; for the church cannot guard with sufficient vigilance the observance of these imposed obligations. As men now are, indeed, this is by all means to be feared; many, to obtain a desirable office, will yield their assent to something, of which they are not convinced, or which they are not willing to maintain. But is this the fault of the church? "The church must not judge of secrets." She cannot see into the heart of any man: she must believe of every man.

so long as his opposition remains concealed, that he means what he speaks. The state imposes an obligation upon her subjects also, to discharge their functions, not according to their own opinions, but according to her positive instructions. If they neglect this, break their oath, or betray the state, she resumes the office thus entrusted, and no one is surprised at it. Should the church allow her servants the liberty to teach and act contrary to her fundamental doctrines, and still retain the unfaithful incumbent in office and in honor,—nay, advance him further and further, only to turn against herself the weapon which she had given him for her protection and defence, when all this affects the church infinitely more than similar conduct affects the state! It affects the salvation of her members; and she has to render an account in future, how she has observed, or how she has neglected, this duty.

Another inquiry is this: How shall the church act towards desponding natures, who in all candor of disposition have been drawn into doubts? The church, with her counsel, takes them by the hand; she admonishes them to search for the truth, with prayer for the illumination of the Holy Spirit, and only not to let their doubts have an influence upon their official labors. Thus she bears these doubts as the natural result of human weakness and imperfection, because she has the power to overcome them, and because she knows, that a real experience of doubt is ever followed, in due time, by additional light from the Lord, from which every doubt immediately vanishes. The church acts and judges in the character, not of political authority, but in the spirit of a mother; she does not break, but she heals; she does not enforce her penalties on this hand and on that, but she soothes and conciliates; and she dismisses from her service that man only, whose thoughts and affections she finds irretrievably alienated.

But says one, "The obligation imposed by church Symbols should be discontinued, because they have no effect in preventing every deviation or transgression." From the same reasoning, we should have to abrogate all laws, divine and human,—they too being transgressed and violated every day. The church does exactly what her duty demands; she enjoins her obligation, and expects him who enters into it, to comply with it. In this way she regulates her own government, she exercises a supervision over her members, by means of her established organs. Beyond this, whatever remains concealed, she submits to the disposal of the Lord; for her interest is indeed no other than His own.

PART II.

OF THE CHIEF SUBJECTS IN THE BOOK OF CONCORD.

I. THE THREE ECUMENICAL OR CATHOLIC SYMBOLS.

The ecumenical or catholic Symbols form the basis of church Symbols. The Lutheran church has placed these in the front part of the Book of Concord, and of her peculiar Symbolic Writings, for the purpose of showing her connection with the pure church of the first centuries, of attaching herself to it, and of testifying, that her Symbols are intended to introduce no new doctrine, but they should be regarded merely as a necessary, growing expansion of the earliest Confession of the church, by historic explanations of the diversified relations of the church.

To the same effect Luther asserts in his writing, "The three Symbols or Confessions of faith in Christ, unanimously used in the church": "Although I have taught and written a great deal already concerning faith, what it is, and what it is able to accomplish, and have also delivered my confession to the public, what I believe and where I am determined to stand, yet I have in addition to this been willing to see the three Symbols, as we usually term them, or Confessions, brought before the world in the German language,—Confessions which have, up to the present time, been maintained, read, and sung in the whole church; and by which I testify again, that I hold with the true Christian church, which has as yet continued to maintain these Symbols or Confessions, and not with the false, vain-glorious church, which is the bitterest enemy to the true church, and which has introduced many idolatries by the side of these beautiful Confessions." In this sense also it is said in the Epitome of the Formula of Concord, where it is written: "And as, immediately after the time of the Apostles, and even while they were yet living, false teachers and heretics arose, against whom Symbols,—that is, short and distinct confessions,—were drawn up in the first churches, which were unanimously held as the universal Christian faith and confession of the orthodox and true churches; namely, the Apostolic Symbol, the Nicene Symbol, and the Athanasian Symbol; we acknowledge these, and hereby reject all heresies and doctrines, which, in opposition to these, have been introduced into the church of God." So the Declaration likewise refers to them, in the preface, designating them as the "three catholic and general Symbols of high authority;" and in reference to that treatise of Luther's called "The three chief Symbols or Confessions of faith in Christ, unanimously used in the church," they were introduced into the Book of Concord.

They were called ecumenical or catholic Symbols, and indeed first called so, according to our information, in the Lutheran church, because they originally obtained and enjoyed the most general acknowledgment and influence in the church above other confessions, and have been regarded always as the truest and purest expression of the doctrines of the Scriptures. Hence a value was attached to them still higher than to other Symbols exclusively belonging to particular churches; as Luther says in reference to this matter: "Those

Symbols, such as the three ecumenical Symbols, which had been approved by the unanimous consent of the whole catholic church, obtained far greater authority than those which were received by the judgment and approbation of some particular churches." For these general Confessions had for their object the sure preservation of the unity and universality of the church. Particular Symbols, on the other hand, should express the conformity of the views of the minister, and of the individual congregations or provincial churches, with the general Symbols. These ecumenical Symbols will be reviewed in the following order:

A. The Apostolic Symbol.

B. The Nicene.

C. The Athanasian.

In the discussion of each of these will be considered—1. Its Appellation and Origin. 2. Its Nature and Design. 3. Its Importance in the regulation of the church; from which we may learn in what relation they stand to each other, and to the Confessional writings of the Lutheran church.

A.—The Apostolic Symbol.

1. *Its Appellation and Origin.*—The Apostolic Symbol, by its very name, refers back to the times of the Apostles. For, though it cannot be proved that it was composed and published by the Apostles, still it reaches back to the earliest times of the church, and stands in perfect harmony with the doctrines of the Apostles, (Acts 2, 42.)

It is certain, the opinion, that as we have to thank the Apostles for the name, so we ought likewise to thank them for the origin of this Symbol, prevailed early in the church; and indeed it has been asserted that the Apostles composed it, either before their mission among the Gentiles, after the effusion of the Holy Ghost, or about the time of the persecution by Herod,—that this inference may be drawn from the Acts of the Apostles, chapter 12, and that it was composed not only as a bond of union, but also for the purpose of having a summary of doctrine and a rule of faith for their congregations. Persons attached to this opinion would find a reference to our Symbol in several places of the Apostolic writings, as 2 John 10; Heb. 5, 12; Rom. 12, 6; 2 Tim. 1, 14. Indeed they have described the very mode and manner, in which the Apostles composed it, and the share which each of them had in the work. In the year 399, Rufinus says: "All, therefore, convened, and being filled with the Holy Ghost, they composed, for themselves as we say, that brief formulary of future ministry, by comparing together what each believed, and they resolved to commit it as a rule to believers." More definitely still does the author of the "Sermons concerning the times," which were long ascribed to Augustine, and are extant in the Benedictine edition of his spurious writings, describe the event. He says: "That which is called a Symbol in Greek, in Latin is termed a *collatio*, or comparison of copies. It is called so, because the faith of the catholic law, mutually compared, is collected in a brief Symbol, the text of which we now declare to you, through the grace of God. Peter said,—'I believe in God the Father Almighty;' John said,—'The Creator of heaven and earth;' James said,—'I

believe also in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, our Lord; Andrew said,—‘Who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary;’ Philip said,—‘Suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried;’ Thomas said,—‘Descended into hell; on the third day arose, from the dead;’ Bartholomew said,—‘Ascended to heaven; sits at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty;’ Matthew said,—‘From whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead;’ James, the son of Alphaeus, said,—‘I believe also in the Holy Ghost; the holy catholic church;’ Simon Zelotes said,—‘The communion of saints; the remission of sins;’ Judas, the son of James, said,—‘The resurrection of the body;’ and Matthias completed the whole, by saying,—‘Eternal life, Amen.’”

John Cassianus, Venantius Fortunatus, Isadore of Spain, William Cave, no less than Hincmar of Rheims, and lastly Vasschius Radbertus, unanimously declare the Apostles to be the authors of this Symbol.

It was also a general belief in the Romish church that the Apostles had constructed this Symbol, and that they composed it by member and by article. This view was taken of it originally in the Lutheran church; the Centuriator of Magdeburg adopts the opinion; Nicholas Schnecker, David Chytraus, Christopher Ireneus, Daniel Cramer, all acknowledge themselves inclined to the same view; and finally those, of whom we shall hereafter speak, and who thought that upon this foundation, they could unite the separated parties of the Christian church again, firmly maintained the Apostolic origin of this Symbol, even after the opinion generally prevailed, that this Symbol did not immediately proceed from the Apostles. The Armenian, Christopher Sand, in his history of the church, countenances the Apostolic origin of this Symbol, for the purpose of vindicating the more forcibly his preference of it to the Nicene Symbol.

The first opposition to this opinion arose in the Romish church itself; Laurence Valla, and after him Erasmus, who in the preface to Matthew, says: “I do not know that it has been composed by the Apostles;” and he manfully maintains his assertion against the censures of the university of Paris. Dupin follows him, but above all, the Reformed Rivetus, Chamier, Vœtius, and especially John Gerh. Vossius, and the English writers Bingham, John Pearson, Peter King, and others. Among the theological writers of the Lutheran church, we notice first of all Luther himself, who does not express any definite opinion either for or against the Apostolic origin of this Symbol; but in his sermon on the Epistle, at the feast of Trinity,* he remarks: “We have neither made nor conceived this Confession, nor did the ancient Fathers; but as the bee seeks her honey from numerous beautiful, breathing flowers, so has this Symbol been collected from the books of the blessed Prophets and Apostles, that is, from the entire holy Scriptures, in a compendious form for children and illiterate Christians. For this reason a person may reasonably term it the Symbol or Faith of the Apostles; for it is so arranged that no one can compose a better or more excellent one in so brief and clear a style. And the opinion has prevailed in the church, from ancient times, that either the Apostles composed it themselves, or it was collected by their best scholars, from their writings or sermons.” This peculiar view is elegantly illustrated, in a pious

* Church Postill, vol. 9, page 29.

and useful explication in his catechism by John Brentius: "Because the composition of these articles by the twelve Apostles, seems to depend more on tradition than on unexceptionable authority, we follow that opinion which appears the more probable. For it is called the Apostolic Symbol, because it contains the *epitome*, the *compendium*, the *substance* of all Apostolic doctrine, indeed, as Luther says above, of every treatise concerning God the Father, the Son, and Holy Spirit. Hence this Symbol ought justly to be regarded as a little bible conveying a true knowledge of God. For there is abundance of internal evidence, that the articles, which in this Symbol have reference to Jesus Christ, were collected into this epitome from the first council, which Peter held on the day of Pentecost, the Apostles being present, and giving their approbation." Further arguments are urged against ascribing the authorship of this Symbol to the Apostles, by Calove, Tentzel, Buddeus, and Gotta. And though, indeed, if we regard the form which it now has, this Symbol may not have been composed by the Apostles themselves, yet that the nature of the materials is Apostolic, no Protestant can deny. John Andrew Quensted remarks that, "It is called Apostolic Symbol, not because it was framed by the Apostles themselves, (for it should be numbered among other canonical writings,) but because it was composed by Apostolic men, who heard the Apostles themselves, and digested it into its present form, not only from their writings, but also from their oral councils." But it was not delivered to the church, in the words which it contains at present, until the fourth century after Christ. The form of this Symbol, both as to the words, as well as the connection and order of the articles, certainly does not agree with the form either in the eastern or western churches, until the fourth century.

The arguments which are employed against ascribing the authorship to the Apostles, are the following:

1. *The silence of the holy Scriptures.* Had the Apostles really been the authors of this Symbol, they would certainly have referred to it in their writings; and assuredly Luke, in the Acts of the Apostles, would not have disregarded so important a fact, since events of far less relative importance are there described.

2. *The equal silence of the primitive church.* The Fathers of the church, Ireneus, Justin Martyr, Clemens of Alexandria, Origen, Tertullian, Eusebius, Hilary, Cyril of Jerusalem, would surely have referred to this, even had it existed merely as traditionary; for it would have been a powerful weapon for them in their conflicts with the heretics. It is true Sixtus of Sienna says all the orthodox Fathers assert, that this Symbol was composed by the Apostles; but he has forgotten to prove by proper authority so positive an assertion.

3. *The nature and import of this Symbol.* in which many important articles of the Christian doctrine are passed over, and many are embraced in expressions so general, that even persons could, and did receive it, who gave the words a different sense from that which the Apostles wish to convey. Had the Apostles really been the authors of this Symbol, as the rule of doctrine and of faith, they would certainly have produced a more comprehensive and satisfactory system.

4. *The number and diversity of Symbols framed by synods and individual teachers of the church, and the confessions of the first centuries, which could*

not have occurred, had a Symbol existed which was sanctioned by Apostolic authority.

5. *The different revisions of the Symbol itself, and the additions*, which it evidently received from time to time; and this could never have occurred, had it been recognised in the primitive church as having Apostolic origin; for in that case, alterations in this Symbol would have no more been attempted, than in the text of the holy Scriptures.

6. *The superscription of this Symbol*, characterizing it as *Apostolic*, is not decisive. Superscriptions frequently do not specify the true author of a work, and in general they have no force, when it is not expressly mentioned from whom they originate. But if we admit that the appellation Apostolic, originally and with justice was applied to this Symbol, the same appellation might be understood in reference to the import or doctrine, just as well as the Nicene Symbol is in reality frequently called Apostolic on account of its doctrine. Besides, the usages of language prove the interchange of *συμβολον* with *collatio* manifestly false.

7. *The traditions of the church* likewise determine nothing, for they depend only upon Rufinus, whose credibility Jerome has rendered very dubious, and upon the unknown author of a work concerning the times, attributed to Augustine. The latter is no evidence, and Rufinus himself does not know how to introduce his information in any other way than by saying, "Our Fathers have said," &c.

8. Finally, it will never do to assert, as the Roman authors Baronius, and others have asserted, in order to establish the traditions of the church, that the *composition of a Symbol by the Apostles* was indispensable. Neither had the Apostles the necessity of such a bond of union, because they enjoyed the far more excellent bond of the Holy Ghost, nor was it necessary for the congregations, for these had the oral and written instructions of the Apostles. The necessity of such a rule of faith became far more indispensable after the death of the Apostles, and in consequence of the ever advancing state of the church, especially after the appearance of heresies, which disturbed its unity.

It is worthy of remark, that some have begun in modern times to ascribe the origin of this Symbol to the Apostles. G. E. Lessing seems determined to ascribe the verbal composition of the Symbol or rule of faith not only to the Apostles, but to Christ himself. Delbrick revives this opinion of Lessing, and says: "Whoever feels the interest of our church near his heart, must rejoice to discern, how the alleged expressions of the church Fathers agree, much to the gratification of Lessing, in testifying unanimously, that the church indeed of the first centuries received an infallible rule of faith immediately from Christ, through the Apostles, as a fountain of immutable doctrine, requiring no proof; and that the verbal and written communications of the Apostles and their successors, were only the effluences from the riches of this."

J. C. Lindberg, in the Symbolical Books of the Danish church, published in Danish and Latin, 1830, endeavors to prove the assertion, that the Apostolic Confession of faith should not be ascribed to the Apostles, entirely groundless and radically false. Rudelbach also boldly declares himself for the Apostolic origin of this Symbol, while he suffers a complete settlement of this controversy to be anticipated; and indeed we should express our ob-

fications anew to this excellent man, to whom the church owes so much, if by his means the question, in this respect, could be brought to a final decision. For if the Apostolic character of this Symbol, and its adoption in the church from the earliest times, were indisputably secured by his explanation, no little would be gained in establishing the proof of its Apostolic origin.

The origin of this Symbol and the time of its production, Laurence Valla ascribes to the oecumenical council at Nice; but Vossius on the contrary maintains that it was published by the leaders of the Romish church, an opinion with which J. K. Swicer coincides, but others, with greater plausibility, assign its first appearance to the second century. More especially, however, P. Spanheim asserts, "that it is very probable the Symbol commonly called Apostolic, was composed in the Romish church, very essential in this age of controversy as to its primary articles, concerning God the Father, the Son, and the Holy Spirit. The elements of the oriental Symbol were the same, used in the primitive eastern church before the Council at Nice, and terminating in the article concerning the Holy Spirit." J. Hornbeek says in relation to this: "There was formerly in the primitive days of the church, a certain Apostolic Symbol.—you may consider it to be that which is mentioned in Matthew 28.—but our Symbol of twelve articles, never had the Apostles for its authors, nor had it their authority; it was framed, indeed, a long time after the age of the Apostles, on various occasions, in opposition to various heresies, and for the support of this or of that article, which the Symbol we now possess has conveyed down to us, by what author it is not known, because it was not composed by one author, or at one time." With this T. Itting, J. F. Buddeus, and Peter King, coincide.

From the want of a more definite specification, the opinion has attained the greatest prevalency, that this Symbol was not completed by one person only, nor at one time, in that form in which we now possess it, and in which it has been presented to the church; that it cannot, with complete certainty, be referred to, either in the oriental or in the western churches, before A. D. 400; and that its completion seems to fall in the sixth or seventh century. Indeed we find our text of this Symbol first published in the Greek Psalter of pope Gregory, according to which Usher makes quotations in his work on the ancient Apostolic Symbol of the Romish church. If any one would contend that the Symbol was first completed in the seventh century, because this manuscript belongs to that period, he would be asserting too much. It is indisputably much older, and it existed in the church in the earliest times, not only in its leading principles, but in the far greater portion of its contents. This the references of the Fathers to this Symbol prove. It is true that it does not stand complete in any of the works by the ancient Fathers, but yet these quotations contribute to the completion of each other; what we miss here, we find there; and the Fathers,—a thing which we must not forget,—did not wish, in these quoted passages, by any means to give a full relation of this Symbol, but only so much as seemed necessary for the object in view. Thus, for the purpose of introducing one example among many, the declaration of Cyprian in his Epistle to Magnus, already referred to above, in which the word *Symbol* is first used concerning confession of Baptism, reads as follows:

"This is a distinction which should prevent any one from saying, that to

hold the same Novatian law, which the Catholic church holds, to baptize with the same Symbol with which we baptize, to acknowledge the same God the Father, the same Son Christ, the same Holy Spirit, enables him to usurp the same power of baptizing, which seems not to differ from us in the ceremony of baptism. Whoever feels inclined to oppose this, let him consider that the first rule of the *Symbol* is not the same with us as with the Schismatics, nor is the interrogation the same. For when they ask,—‘Do you believe the remission of sins and life everlasting by the holy church!’—they speak falsely in this interrogation, because they have no church. Besides they confess with their own lips, that the remission of sins cannot take place unless through the holy church, and, not possessing such a church, they prove that these sins are not forgiven.” So again, according to Leo the Great, in a similar passage to Flavianus, bishop of Constantinople, against the heresy of Eutychis, he demands: “How can any one make the necessary proficiency in reference to the sacred pages of the New and of the Old Testament, who does not understand the beginning of his own *Symbol*? The sentiments which drop from the lips of all those about to be baptized, throughout the world, have not yet entered into the heart of this old man Eutychis. Ignorant, therefore, of what he ought to think of the Incarnation of the Word of God, and not wishing to labor in diffusing the light of intelligence, in the full extent designed by the holy Scriptures, he has regarded, with anxious attention, that Confession, at least as ordinary and imprudent, by which all the faithful profess to believe in Almighty God, and in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Spirit, and of the Virgin Mary; by which three expressions the schemes of almost all the heretics are defeated.”

Very remarkable too appears a passage in the epistle of Ignatius to Trallian: “Be ye deaf, then, when any one shall preach to you, without the authority of Jesus Christ, who was of the family of David, of the Virgin Mary; who was truly begotten, truly delivered up to Pontius Pilate, was truly crucified and died; who also was truly raised from the dead,—his Father raising him.”

Although we do not find this passage introduced into any work upon our Symbol, yet we believe it demands attention on account of its peculiar members, especially in the words, “was delivered to Pontius Pilate,” and then again, “was crucified,” (ἐδωκεν ὡς θῆνη εἰς τὸ σταυρῶσθαι.) Who does not feel the vigorous style of the Apostles running through the whole?

In connection with the *form* of baptism naturally came the *confession* at baptism, in reference to which, the applicant for baptism was prepared by the instruction preceding baptism. For this contained the fundamental articles of Christian faith, with which every thing else is connected in imparting instruction. Tertullian calls this system, “the Christian sacrament and substance of the New Testament;” other Fathers call it “the Canon of Truth;” “the ancient token of the church;”—“the rule of truth;”—“the tradition of truth;”—“the ministry, the heraldry, the faith of the church;”—“the legal, catholic faith;”—“the sacrament of faith;” “the pure tradition;” and simply, “the faith,” “the rule,” “the truth,” always referring it to the Apostles.

2. *Nature and Design of this Symbol.*—An examination of its Nature proves, that the Apostolic Symbol was an expansion of the form of bap-

tism, but not a system of the whole Christian doctrine, constructed for the purpose of instruction. And therefore many integral points are wanting in it,—as, in reference to the unbounded grace of God,—the merit of Christ,—the personal union of the natures in Christ, and in consequence the conditional communication of attributes,—the issue of the Holy Ghost,—the origin and the nature of sin,—justification by faith,—conversion and regeneration,—the means of grace, and many other subjects. But who would consider this omission as a defect in this Symbol? The Nature of this Symbol determines its Design. It was a confession at baptism, and as such, as is evident from its very character, it could represent, not so well the whole doctrinal system, as the historical facts of the Gospel, which are the groundwork of faith. Therefore, beside the Symbol were placed, for the purpose of explanation and instruction, the rules of faith or of truth in the church, which, fixing upon the words of the Symbol, penetrated their meaning, and unfolded the whole scheme of Christian perception to catechumens. The text of this Symbol itself was committed to the applicant a short time before baptism, with the admonition to commit it to memory; for on the one hand, the mystery of the same should, by this means, be secured from the uninitiated, and guarded against his profanation,—a thing to be dreaded by a general publicity; and on the other hand, the new Christians, instructed in a symbolic manner, that it is their duty to make this Symbol their own in such a manner as never to lose it, as Augustine remarks: “In order that you may retain the words of the Symbol, you ought by no means to write, but to learn them by hearing, nor to write them down when you shall have learned them, but always to keep and retain them in your memory. For whatever you are about to hear contained in the Symbol, is contained in the divine writings of the holy Scriptures. But that which has been thus collected and reduced into a certain form, should not be written, and it serves to remind us of the promise of God, when predicting the New Testament through the Prophet, he said, Jer. 31, 33: ‘This is my covenant,’ &c. For the purpose of suggesting this passage, the Symbol is learned by hearing, nor is it written upon tables or upon any substance, but upon the heart.” And Jerome says to the same effect: “The Symbol of our faith and our hope, which was written by the Apostles, not upon paper and with ink, but in the fleshy tables of the heart,—hence the Greek Fathers frequently call it *το μαθημα*.”

The delivery of this Symbol on the part of the church to persons before baptism, corresponded with the return which they were required to make of it. When they had committed it to memory, they were required to rehearse it, in the first place to their catechets, and afterwards to acknowledge it publicly before the whole congregation, and especially at Baptism, to answer verbally from the Symbol the questions put to them upon the particular articles, of which the quotation from Cyprian given above, and many others from the Fathers, are abundant evidence, and likewise according to what Tertullian says in his treatise concerning the origin of baptismal rites: “After this, let us be immersed three times, making a greater number of answers [*amplius aliquid respondentes*] than the Lord has pointed out in the Gospel.”

And thus perpetually the knowledge of the Symbol and of the Lord's Prayer was the *least* of that which the church required of those who wished to become her members; while she,—in consequence of the regulation, that those who were destitute of this knowledge should not be allowed the privi-

lege of becoming sponsors, (for it was the duty of the sponsor to direct his god-son or god-daughter in the knowledge of the Creed,) or of enjoying the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but to be subjected to the rigor of canonical laws,—she, I say, was endeavoring to secure the preservation of the same. Even thus the delivery of the baptismal confession was, at a later period, required from the confidants also, so that it might take the place of that return of the Symbol at baptism, for those who received baptism in their infancy. The Evangelical church has connected this act of returning the Symbol with confirmation; and she considers a knowledge of the Symbol an indispensable attainment for a Christian.

Now, if in the commencement, the Design of the Symbol was exclusively internal, when the knowledge and the use of it was first accounted among the mysteries of the church, it should still be reasonable that this Symbol continue a defence to the Christian against the dangerous influence of heretics, who will never cease their assaults from without. We shall, indeed, no more refer to the purely external view of Samuel Basnage and others, according to which each of the twelve articles of the Symbol, into which it was originally divided, through the fond belief that every particular article was constructed by one of the twelve apostles—every word indeed was supposed to be directed against some particular heresy; but still we shall have to observe a reference to heretical doctrines as connected with the design of this Symbol. As heresies are directed against the orthodox doctrine, this Symbol must naturally be brought into conflict with them, and it will serve as a shield to every true confessor. In this conviction, we should be perfectly satisfied, if any one shall say to us: “The second article,—the Almighty Creator of heaven and earth,—is directed against the Gnostics; the fourth,—conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary,—is against the heretical opinions of Ebion, Cerinthus, and others, who denied the supernatural conception of Christ, as it is against Jovinian, who denied the undefiled virginity of Mary after the birth of the Lord, indicated by the expression, ‘A virgin conceived, but a virgin did not bring forth;’ the fifth,—‘suffered under Pontius Pilate and was buried,’—is against Menander, Cerdon, Saturninus, and others, who believe only in an apparent body of Christ; the sixth,—‘descended into hell,’—is against the Arians, the Eunomians, and especially against the Apollinarians; the seventh,—‘ascended to heaven, sits at the right hand of God the Almighty Father,’—is against Apelles and his followers; the eighth,—‘from whence he shall come to judge the world,’—is against Marcian, Cerdon, the Valentinians, the Basilidians, the Carpocratians, and others; so too the tenth article,—‘of the communion of saints, and the remission of sins,’—is against the Donatists, and against the Montanists and Novatians; finally, the eleventh,—‘of the resurrection of the body,’—is against the opponents of that doctrine.” But to overthrow this view—which is so entirely external—that this Symbol was prepared against these heresies alone, and for no other purpose,—that heresy was the sole cause of its origin,—we need only remember the remarkable expression of Rudeltack: “There is a conclusion forever infallible,—the Truth which was manifested in Christ, was first, and the lies came hobbling after it.”

For the purpose of affording a brief view of the important diversities of text, which appear in existing copies of this Symbol, we shall give, in

conclusion, some examples, from the admirable Library of the Symbol by Hahn.

1. *The Romish form of the Symbol according to Ruffinus*: "I believe in God the Father Almighty; and in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, our Lord. Who was born of the Holy Ghost, of the Virgin Mary, crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried; on the third day he arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father; from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Spirit, the holy church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body."

2. *Confession of the Faith by Marcellus of Ancyra*: "I believe in God Almighty, and in Jesus Christ his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and buried, and on the third day arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father, from whence he will come to judge the quick and the dead; and in the Holy Ghost, the holy church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting."

3. *A Greek Formula, from a manuscript of the eighth century, according to Jacob Usher*: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus, his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of" &c.,—"and in the Holy Ghost, the holy [church], the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body. Amen."

4. *A Latin Formula, from a manuscript of the seventh or eighth century, according to the same authority*. (The verbal errors must be set to the account of transcribers): "I believe in God the Father Almighty, and in Christ Jesus, his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost and of the Virgin Mary, who was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried; on the third day he arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father, from whence he will come to judge the quick and the dead. And in the Holy Ghost, the holy church, the remission of sins, and the resurrection of the body."

5. *This Form,—abridged for the Liturgy,—is according to the Sacramentarium of Gelasius*. Hahn, with great reason, believes this form to be the original one: "I believe in God, the Father Almighty, and in Jesus Christ, his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born and who suffered; and in the Holy Ghost, the holy church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body."

6. *Text transcribed from the Greek Psalter of pope Gregory, according to Usher*: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. And in Christ Jesus, his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was conceived of the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried, descended into hell, on the third day arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost, the holy catholic church, the communion of saints, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. Amen."

7. *Aquileian Form of the Symbol, according to Ruffinus*: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, invisible and impassive; and in Christ Jesus, his only-begotten Son, our Lord, who was born of the Holy Ghost, of the Vir-

gin Mary, was crucified under Pontius Pilate, and was buried, descended into hell, on the third day he arose from the dead, ascended into heaven, sits at the right hand of the Father: from whence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. And I believe in the Holy Ghost; the holy church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body."

3. *The Authority and Significancy of this Symbol.*—That the church from the earliest times ascribed the highest importance and significancy to the Apostolic Symbol, is incontestable. A manifest proof of this is, its careful concealment in the first centuries. And then the use which the church made of it as a general baptismal confession, at the communion table, and generally in divine service; but more especially the fact, that she made it an integral part of the Catechism, for the instruction of the progressive Christian. Nor is its importance any less in our own times; since we make not only the same use of it, but have to observe it, since the Reformation, as a bond by which the separate churches are held together.

Though we should hope and strive for a union founded upon the efficacy of this Symbol, as Calixtus, Laterman, Dreyer, and others wish to see, it is sufficiently discussed in those critical controversies, and with reason denied. It is true indeed, that "if not all the articles of faith are contained in it, with formal and definite distinction," still they can all be deduced from it, implicitly, virtually, and by an easy inference, as a necessary consequence; and it shows us the history of the Christian system of doctrine, how soon the church saw it necessary to establish the Apostolic creed by statements more extensive and definite. And the fact too, that heretics themselves employed this Symbol as a baptismal confession, and drew from it the same interrogatories as the orthodox church, which they put to those about to be baptized, proves incontestably, that it is not sufficient to secure the union and purity of the faith of the church in her temporal relations. But this double import of this Symbol ever continues to be at once a bond of union to the whole Christian church, and the rudiments out of which the other Symbols are formed; and if in our days, fallen as it seems in utter confusion, so ill-founded an opposition has arisen against the authority and use of this Symbol in the church, we may deplore the new symptoms of disease, in the unbounded strifes and efforts of visionary minds, and only from the remarkable and complete confusion of ideas which is prevalent in this generation, can we explain the claim, the presumption, to withdraw from this comprehensive testimony of truth, which alone is the *original* and *infallible* Christian evidence, and the claim at the same time to be a Christian and a member of the Christian church, yes, even a prominent one. We may here, however, introduce the words of Irenæus, from his work written in opposition to the heretics: "The church has employed the same proclamation, and the same faith; although that church is dispersed into all parts of the world, it watches with the same vigilance as if it occupied but one house, and preserves the same uniformity of faith, as if it had but one soul and one heart, proclaiming these truths, teaching, and imparting instruction, as if it were collected and framed into one body."

B.—The Nicene Symbol.

1. *Its Appellation and Origin.*—This Symbol derives its name from the first general church-council, held at Nice in Bithynia, where 318 bishops of Europe, Asia, and Africa, assembled in obedience to the summons of Constantine the Great, in order to restore the peace of the church, agitated by the heresy of Arius. Here the necessity immediately presented itself, of securing the elements of Christian faith, contained in the Apostolic Symbol, by a new Form of doctrine unanimously agreed upon, and calculated to adjust impending controversies, and in addition to this, of determining, with due care and accuracy, the meaning of some passages in the Apostolic Symbol, under the color of which Arius might insinuate his false opinions. For Arius did not refuse to acknowledge the Apostolic Symbol with the rest of the church, but always understood it in a sense widely different from that of the orthodox church. Herein it was necessary to resist him, and herein we are to seek for the difference between the Nicene and the Apostolic creeds.

This Confession of Faith adopted by the synod at Nice, was afterwards repeated by the second ecumenical council held at Constantinople in 381; and in proportion to relative passages which this church-council had introduced, it was increased by additions directed against the heresies which had arisen since the council at Nice. In the form which it now assumed, it obtained universal influence in the church, and, accordingly, it might with propriety be distinguished by the appellation, the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol.

The following individuals are mentioned as authors of the Nicene Form: 1. Hosius, bishop of Corduba, who sat as president of the council, and of whom, according to Athanas, the Arians, Ursacius and Valens say to Constantius: "This man also constructed the creed at Nice;" by which it is to be understood, not that he composed it, but that he made a verbal delivery of the faith in the name of the Synod. 2. Eusebius, bishop of Cæsarea, one of the most learned members of the Synod, entertaining the opinion, however, that the doctrine of Arius was not in opposition to the faith of the church. 3. Hermogenes, concerning whom Basil the Great says in a letter: "The beloved Hermogenes, who wrote our great and accurate creed in the illustrious council." 4. Athanasius, at that time deacon. 5. Macarius, bishop of Jerusalem, concerning whom Josephus, the Egyptian, says: "The emperor ordered the creed which the bishop of Jerusalem had written to him, to be read in the synod of bishops, and they adopted it by the voice of 318 bishops." The most probable opinion is, that the emperor had given orders to a greater number of bishops, to compose a form of Faith, among which that of Eusebius obtained the general approbation, the only one containing the additional word *ομολοσιος*, which was inserted at the request of the emperor, as Eusebius himself informs us. This Form of the creed was originally written in the Greek language, and was afterwards translated into Latin by Hilarius of Pictavium.

2. *Its Nature and Design.*—To be able to estimate with precision the nature and design of this Symbol, it is necessary to examine the original text of both the Nicene and the Constantinopolitan Symbol, and to bring under one view the differences between them. As Hahn and Giesler have

preserved them, we shall give the form of the first according to the epistle of Eusebius to the people of Cæsarea; of the second, according to the Acts of the council of Constantinople and of Chalcedon.

a.) *Nicene Symbol*: "We believe in one God the Father, almighty Creator of all things visible and invisible, and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the Son of God, only-begotten of the Father, of equal power with the Father, God of God, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of like nature with the Father, and by him all things were made which are in heaven and in the earth; who for us mortals, and for our salvation, came down, and took upon himself human flesh, and became man, suffered, and arose the third day, ascended into heaven, and will come to judge the quick and the dead. And we believe in the Holy Ghost. And let the catholic church anathematize those who say that there was a time when the Son of God was not,—that before he was begotten, he did not exist,—and that he came from non-existence into being; or those who say that he is of a different substance or property, or that he was created, produced, or that he is a different being."

b.) *The Constantinopolitan Symbol*: "We believe in one God, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible; and in one Lord, Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, who was begotten of the Father from all eternity, light of light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, of like nature with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us mortals, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and entered into flesh, from the Holy Ghost and the Virgin Mary, became man, and was crucified for us under Pontius Pilate, and suffered, and was buried, and rose on the third day according to the Scriptures, ascended into heaven, and sat down at the right hand of the Father, and shall come again in his glory to judge the quick and the dead, and of his kingdom there shall be no end. And we believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord, the Giver of life, who proceedeth from the Father, who with the Father and the Son is adored and glorified, who is spoken of by the Prophets. We believe in one holy, catholic, Apostolic church. We confess one baptism for the remission of sins; we believe the resurrection of the dead, and a life everlasting to come. Amen."

If both these Forms be compared with the Apostolic Symbol, and with each other, it will be perceived that the former sufficiently agrees with the latter, that there is no variation, but merely an extension, rendered indispensable by the necessities of the times; and hence the design of these additions immediately becomes evident. It was especially necessary too in the Nicene Form to withstand the heresy of Arius, and to acknowledge the divinity of the Son, and the unity of his essence with the Father. And on account of this, the council retained only that part of the third article which refers to the Holy Ghost; and instead of the other sentences, it inserted a positive rejection of the doctrine of Arius, and the consequences resulting from it, and hence it happened that those sentences were omitted to which, as yet, there had been no opposition.

The Constantinopolitan Form, which had to maintain the divinity of the Holy Ghost against Macedonius, retains the additions belonging to this, and in addition to this again, or rather, on the same account, the third article of the Apostolic Symbol, in its complete form. This completed Form

is that which was afterwards received into our Book of Concord, according to the Latin translation of Dionysius Exiguus, in a better form, however, and approaching more accurately the sense of the Greek text. We observe in this the following variations: in the Symbol of Dionysius the word *unigenitum* is wanting, so likewise the words, God of God, light of light; instead of *genitum*, Dionysius has *natum*; instead of *homo factus*, he has *humanatus*; the word *passus* is wanting; the expression *secundum scripturas* is wanting; instead of *qui ex Patre Filioque procedit, qui—adoratur et glorificatur*, Dionysius has *ex Patre procedentem, cum—adorandum et glorificandum*; again, he has *per sanctos Proph.*, instead of *per Proph.*; *futuri* instead of *venturi*.

The most important variation here is the noted word *Filioque*, which excited so great a commotion in the church. The writers of the Romish church, especially Baronius and Severinus Binius, assert that this addition already contained in the Symbol of Constantinople, was suppressed by the Greeks; and they wish to impute all the blame for these schisms in the church, to these people only. Some Protestant theologians also, among whom is John L. Hartman, approve this opinion. But it has long been placed beyond all doubt, that neither in the Form of Constantinople, nor even in the rescript of it in the subsequent councils at Ephesus and Chalcedon, do these additions appear, but it was first interpolated at the third council in Toledo, A. D. 589, and acquired general repute in the western churches not until several centuries later. For Leo III. himself, who was requested by the legates of the council held at Aachen under Charles the Great, in the year 809, to complete the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Form with these additions, did not consent, but caused this Symbol, still without the additions, to be engraved upon a tablet of silver. Vossius believes that Sergius III. had these first ratified by the authority of the Pope.

3. *Its Authority and Significance.*—The Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol attained great authority in the church, if not equal authority with the Apostolic Symbol. The high importance which it has secured is proved by the epithets which have been applied to it by synods and writers of the church. They call it “the Divine and Apostolic creed,” “the Gospel creed,” “the System of Truth,” “the Canon of the creed,” “the Consent of faith,” “the Divine Symbol of faith,” “the best and most accurate Formula of faith.” And then again the extensive use, which has been made of it in divine service, proves its importance. It has been sung or chanted in the church, received in the canon of Mass, since the time of Benedict VIII., and the confession of it has always been regarded as a sign of orthodoxy. In the Oriental church it entirely superseded the Apostolic Symbol, and was used instead of that as a symbol at baptism. Concerning the Abyssinian church, Isenberg writes, that it did not even know the Apostolic Symbol, but employed only the Nicene. And indeed this must be understood exclusively in reference to the Nicene Symbol. For even the conflict with the western churches, and the resulting schisms of the church, especially the objection which eastern churches made to the insertion of the word *Filioque*, induced her to retain only the Nicene Symbol to the exclusion of the Constantinopolitan, whilst the western churches on account of that word, adopted the latter.

C.—The Athanasian Symbol.

1. *Its Appellation and Origin.*—The third ecumenical Symbol, called also the *quicumque Symbolum*, from the word with which it commenced, has improperly taken the name of Athanasian, while it is abundantly evident, that it could not have been composed by Athanasius, though it is ascribed to him by its superscription in our Book of Concord. And notwithstanding the Romish writers, Baronius, Ballarinus, and others, sought every means to clear up the difficulties against the authorship of Athanasius, yet the preponderance of the opposite opinion increased. In addition to the evidences for an opinion long prevalent, B. Montfaucon has collected the following:—1. Athanasius nowhere makes any mention of this Symbol, but he frequently expresses his opposition to so great a diversity of forms of Confession. 2. The oldest and best manuscripts of his works do not contain it, indeed he has many expressions of a contrary tendency. 3. The transcripts and translations of this Symbol, besides Athanasius, mention sometimes a certain Bonifacius, and sometimes Anastasius, but most frequently no one is mentioned as the author of it. 4. The testimonies in support of the opinion that Athanasius was the author, are found much later, not before the eighth century, and there is always a doubt attending even these testimonies. It was first particularly acknowledged about the year 1233, when pope Gregory IX. sent it along with his legates despatched to Constantinople, for the purpose of making an effort for a union with the Greeks, as a groundwork for their negotiations. 5. Neither Cyril of Alexandria, nor Leo the Great, nor the council at Ephesus or at Chalcedon, make mention of Nestorius or Eutychis, to whom this Symbol has particular reference. 6. Gregory of Nazianzen, and other biographers of Athanasius, do not mention him as the author of this Symbol. 7. This Symbol appears frequently in connection with more supposititious writings of Vigilius of Tapsus, ascribed to Athanasius. The internal evidences are the following:—1. The style and arrangement forcibly prove that this Symbol was originally composed in Latin, a language which Athanasius, according to his own declaration, did not understand. 2. Verbal expressions, which were peculiar to Athanasius, as *ομοουσιος*,—that *shibboleth* of the orthodox church in the fourth century,—do not appear in this Symbol; while on the contrary, expressions which took their origin later, from the contest against the heresies of Nestorius and Eutychis, and which came into vogue through the council at Chalcedon, such as the word *persona*, *πρωταδεις*, which Athanasius and those of his time had avoided as tinctured with Sabellianism, do appear. The words *et filio*, even if the doctrine, that the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Son also, was at no time held in doubt by the church, remind us of the fact, that this addition to the Nicene-Constantinopolitan Symbol belongs to a later period.

From the want of a more precise statement of facts, it could not fail but a great variety of conjectures must arise about the probable author of this Symbol. It has been ascribed to Athanasius, who was bishop of Spire, about the year 642; to Hilarius of Poitiers, 354; to pope Anastasius I., 398; to Anastasius the Sinaite, finally patriarch of Alexandria, 599; to Anastasius, the librarian, 870; to Eusebius of Vercelli, 354. The most general suffrage, however, has been given to Hilarius of Arles, about the year 430; to Vin-

centius of Lerin, 434; to Venantius Fortunatus, 560; and especially to Vigilius, bishop of Tapsus, who, as above remarked, published several more treatises, and among them our Symbol also, under the name of Athanasius. The resemblance of style, and his participation in the controversy of the Arians, the Nestorians, and the Eutychians, should strongly incline us to this opinion. It is an opinion of Giesel worthy of remark, that the origin of this Symbol must be sought for in Spain, where several councils of Toledo, beginning with the plan of it, expanded the Nicene Confession of Faith, especially as to the articles concerning the Trinity and the Incarnation of Christ, into the modes of expression peculiar to the Athanasian creed; and in several sentences, the former accords with this, without being, however, dependent upon it. According to these forms, this Symbol seems to have been framed in Spain during the seventh or eighth century, and towards the end of the eighth, to have been conveyed to France. And the old appellation,—Creed of Athanasius,—which, at a later period was misunderstood, as being applied to it from Athanasius, must be referred to Spain. For the catholic faith could have been originally distinguished as the creed of Athanasius, only by the Arians, in contradistinction to the creed of Arius, as their system was termed by their opponents; but the Arians in Spain for the greatest length of time stood opposed to the Athanasians. To this, however, Kölner in his *Symbols*, urges the following objections, which at the same time give support to the opinion that this Symbol arose in France in the fifth century:—1. The oldest probable testimonies of Avitus of Vienne and Cæsarius of Arles refer it to the French. 2. Venantius Fortunatus wrote his commentary in France. 3. The Gallic church first adopted it, and it found general circulation, and became a subject of general reference by the Gallic bishops and councils; and still further its insertion in the Gallic Psalter, with which it was disseminated in other countries. 4. The oldest translation, as well as the most numerous and oldest manuscripts appeared in France.

2. *Its Nature and Design.*—Since we know nothing with certainty either of the real author of this Symbol, or of the time of its composition, or of the circumstances under which it appeared, or which in all probability gave it existence, we can make only some very general remarks in reference to its design, or merely infer what that design was, from its nature. If therefore we retain the same superscription which this Symbol bears in our Book of Concord, as well as in Luther's treatise on the Three Symbols, introduced as the Symbol of Athanasius, written against the Arians, we discover nevertheless its design clearly expressed in the first and last sentences: "Whoever wishes to be saved, above all things it is necessary to maintain the catholic faith" and then: "This is the catholic faith," &c. It thus teaches the faith of the catholic, that is, the universal orthodox church, and thus, not so much in the form of a Confession,—as it does not begin with the usual expression, "we believe,"—but in short, compendious sentences, to which a further explanation is afterwards added. The pointed force of these sentences, the perspicuity with which they all explain the doctrine in reference to the Trinity and the relation of the three persons of the divine essence to each other, point always to the time in which the catholic faith entered into an open warfare against all kinds of heresy, and determined upon their rejection: and therefore, the design of

this Symbol can be described in no better way, than in the words of Luther: "The other Symbol, that of St. Athanasius, is longer, and gives one article in fuller detail, on account of the Arians:—namely, the article that Jesus Christ is the only Son of God, and our Lord, to whom we cleave with the faith with which we cleave to the Father, as the text reads in the first Symbol: 'I believe on God,' &c., 'and on Christ,' &c. For if he were not the true God, he could not be honored with the same faith, equally with the Father. For this, Athanasius in his Symbol labors and contends, and it is truly the saving principle of the first Symbol." Indeed this is true; and if we could not prove by any reference, that it was composed with this express design, yet it is the necessary extension, confirmation, and security for the Apostolic Symbol, though it discusses the three articles in the Form less diffusely than the Nicene Symbol. Its nature therefore proves it to be the catholic creed, the maintenance of which it declares necessary for our salvation. That by this the sufficiency of a mere historical faith, or a merely external ecclesiastical orthodoxy, is in no wise maintained,—a reproach, which has been thrown upon this Symbol,—we have only to refer to the living and life-giving truths which it embodies. With equal justice we might utter the same reproach against many passages of the holy Scriptures, which insist upon the necessity of faith. Should we feel inclined to blame this peculiarity of the Symbol, as being too exclusive, we must remember, that it is the duty and privilege of the church to regard herself as the pillar and fortress of truth, exclusively against all heresies. The question here is, as it is in relation to every Symbol, not whether we shall give free scope to the inclination and caprice of men, which the flesh seeks, but whether this Symbol will stand the test, if measured with the rule of God's Word.

3. *Its Authority and Significancy.*—The Christian church has considered this Symbol a correct expression of her faith, and has arranged it in the third place among the ecumenical Symbols, a rank which its character and antiquity seemed to claim for it. And if the western churches exceeded the eastern in their estimation of this Symbol, it was in consequence of the very natural reason, that it had arisen in the midst of them, but in a short time afterwards, the eastern churches followed their example.

It was gradually received into all the distinct churches throughout the country, and generally used in their public services. This assertion is made on the authority of Adelbert, bishop of Teroune: "The Symbol in the sermon of St. Athanasius, whom the catholic church were accustomed to attend with the utmost reverence, and it commences thus, 'Whoever,'" &c. To the same effect, Albo, in his treatise on the "Sacred Harmony of the Church," declares that, "upon the evidence of Honorius, this Symbol was formerly sung every day, but now it is repeated on Sabbaths in a full attendance of the whole congregation, and the confession of our holy faith, on that day, is publicly celebrated." The council of Savaurense ordained, that this Symbol be sung only in the morning, because it was published at the time when the thick night and darkness of heresies and of errors, were universally exposed and dispelled. Therefore, on account of its use in the church, it was ordained that every member should commit it to memory.

The Evangelical church received this Symbol among her confessional writings, as an evidence of her conformity with the ancient church in every

thing which belongs to the catholic faith. But although Ballerman and other Romish writers charge Luther, with having ascribed little importance to the Athanasian Symbol, indeed to the whole doctrine of the Trinity, it is sufficient in reference to the latter charge, to refer to the numerous sermons and other writings of Luther, which furnish us with abundant evidence, that in regard to the Trinity, he has invariably adhered to the doctrine laid down in the Scripture; and in reference to the former it is only necessary to remember, not only some of his declarations already referred to in relation to this Symbol, but also some passages in his comments on the prophet Joel, where he says in reference to the Symbol: "I know not whether there was any thing written, since the time of the Apostles, more important and more sacred in the church of the New Testament."

The numerous translations of this Symbol into other languages, furnish abundant evidence of the reputation which it had acquired. We have already alluded to the Greek translation of it, and it was, soon after its appearance, translated into the Hebrew, Arabic, Anglo-Saxon, and German languages.

II. THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

1. *Its Appellation and Origin.*—Thirteen years had already elapsed, since Luther made the first attempt towards the Reformation. To be convinced how necessary this had become, we shall have to take a hasty glance at the condition of the church, which indeed had taken the ecumenical Symbols as her foundation, but had also, in the course of time, permitted numerous abuses in doctrine and worship, to be introduced and superadded to these Symbols. Luther was not the first to perceive this; but all the efforts which had been made to restore the church to a knowledge and performance of her duty, had proved unavailing, up to the time of his appearance. Yet now the time was ripe when Luther, or rather the power of God through him, was to pronounce the irrevocable fiat, which thousands of minds perceived to be only the expression of that which had been living in their own bosoms, and had become the object of their warmest desire.

Luther did not stand alone, as more or less of his predecessors, all the eminent men of his age, stood at his back, and hence his views spread abroad with the rapidity of lightning,—his efforts found in the minds of all a joyful acknowledgment, and a heartfelt reception. Only in the church, as she had been founded amidst the depravity and infirmity of men, the work of the Reformation met with no encouragement. The hierarchy would have had to yield up their existence at the same time with their errors. Hence they endeavored to defeat the efforts of Luther: and because they were unable to suppress these, it was natural that a renewed church should be erected, which should acknowledge the Word of God as the fountain of faith, in all the elementary principles of her belief, and, as an evidence of her internal harmony, of her identity with the pure and primitive church, should make the general confessions of that church her own.

The church of the Reformation had already, in many ways, made known these her fundamental principles. She had employed them with great

advantage in the assemblies of the states of the empire, appointed for the suppression of errors in belief, and she had offered to establish them also in "a free, Christian, general council;" for although it arose in Germany, yet the Reformation should be a matter for the whole of Christendom. The German emperor, Charles V., perceiving indeed the importance of these matters, but not comprehending them in all their magnitude, cherished the hope that he might, by gentle means, again restore the Evangelical estates of the empire to a reconciliation with the Roman See. He perceived that these dissensions would greatly impair the union and power of the German dominions, as well as his own imperial authority; and therefore, on the 21st of January, 1530, he proclaimed a diet of the estates general, to take place at Augsburg, on the 8th of April. In reference to this most important object of the Diet, the imperial mandate goes on to say: "In order to consult further about the dissensions in reference to our holy religion and Christian faith,—how the opinions and sentiments of contending parties on the subject of religion, might be mutually expressed, explained, and considered, with moderation, mildness, and affection; that each party might abandon or correct the errors, which had been discussed or avowed in their writings, and reduce their unanimous opinions to one plain standard of truth and Christian harmony; that one pure and true religion being cherished and preserved among us, we may be able to live in harmony and concord in one Christian church also, in the same manner as we subsist and serve under one Christ."

Thus an opportunity was given to the Evangelical estates of the empire to appear with a general confession of faith. They perceived at the same time the whole importance of the occasion. The faithful and pious chancellor, Dr. Gregory Fontanus, advised, that "those opinions to which we had hitherto adhered, and in which we still persisted, should be brought together in a systematic form, supported by evidences from the Word of God, in order that we might have something in writing to present." And thus elector John of Saxony gave orders to Luther, Jonas, Bugenhagen, and Melancthon, on the 14th of March, 1530, under the instruction of the imperial proclamation, "To draw up the articles concerning which there had been contentions, both in faith and in other external usages and ceremonies of the church, and personally to deliver them to him at Torgau on the Sunday of Oculi." The accomplishment of this labor was prolonged, however, for some time, as may be seen by another communication of the elector to the above-named theologians, on the 21st of March; his desire, however, was finally complied with, and the draft when finished was afterwards made an element in a system of Confession by Melancthon, as appears from a letter of the elector to Luther, dated at Augsburg, on the 11th of May,—in which he says: "After you and some others of our learned theologians at Wittenburg, in obedience to our gracious order and request, had brought those articles, which have become the subject of controversy, into a form of notes, we desire not to conceal it from you, that Mr. Philip Melancthon revised these notes, and drew them up into a system, and we now return them to you. And it is our gracious desire that you will now still further revise these articles, and that you may feel yourself under no restraint, in pointing out by some little notes or remarks, any portions which may please you, or any thing you think proper to censure or to add." The reply of Luther, May 15, is generally known: "I have read over the Cop-

fession by Mr. Philip Melancthon, and I am well pleased with it. I can find nothing in it to improve or to change; nor would such an attempt become me: for, in this art, I cannot move along so softly and gracefully as he. We hope and pray that Christ our Lord may cause this work to produce a train of great results. Amen."

We remark, that in the writings of the elector the reference is to the *controverted articles*,—"Articles concerning which there is some controversy." Consequently to these was to be referred the draft by the theologians of Wittenburg, and the second part of the Confession, "Articles concerning which there is dissension, and in which are related the abuses which have been corrected," is the place where we have to seek this draft. But the seventeen articles, which Luther had completed in 1529, in his controversy with Zwinglius at Marburg, lay the foundation for the first part of the Confession, or the Articles of Faith and Doctrine. These articles were altered, here and there, at Marburg, and then laid before the second Suabian Convent, Oct. 16, 1529, and adopted; and they were very probably transmitted by the theologians at Wittenburg to the elector at Torgau, at the same time with their own draft, and another treatise on Faith and Works.

These three works,—the seventeen Suabian Articles, (or rather the Articles of Marburg,) the treatise on Faith and Works, and the draft of the Controverted Articles,—were laid before Melancthon at Augsburg, in order to be arranged into one system, for the purpose of being presented as a public Confession before the Emperor and his subjects. It is sufficiently known how earnestly he took this work to heart, how deeply he pondered every word of it, being fully aware of its high importance. And indeed all the Evangelical party had to go to work, with greater diligence, to ensure the success of their Confession; for the circumstances under which it would have to be exhibited at Augsburg, gave to them only a stronger motive to be solicitous for the future. According to the language of the Emperor's proclamation for a general diet of the empire, he had expressed himself very friendly disposed towards them,—“Kindly and graciously desiring that the electors, princes, and the estates general, put down in writing, in the German and Latin languages, their views and opinions of the errors, dissensions, and abuses already referred to, and deliver a copy, in order that these errors and dissensions may be the better collated and compared, and the sooner reduced to a unanimous Christian system.” But these fair prospects soon became darkened: and he who came to the diet filled with the best hopes, could not fail to see the surrounding perils which threatened the Reformation.

The Emperor already at Piacenza, had very ungraciously received the messengers of the Evangelical party, who had to deliver to him their protestation, towards the close of the diet at Spire, 1529, indeed he had them arrested. He delayed the investiture of the elector of Saxony under various pretexts, and in the meanwhile appeared to lend a willing ear to the opponents of the Protestants, who had gathered around him at Innsbruck. We shall not stop to consider this. For the declarations of the Emperor above alluded to, and particularly the occurrences in Italy, seemed better calculated to facilitate his negotiations with the Pope. We turn our attention to the events at the diet itself. There the Emperor was long expected, and not until the evening of the 15th of June did he arrive at Augs-

burg, where the elector John of Saxony had already come on the second of May, the landgrave Philip of Hesse on the twelfth, two days after which the duke Ernst of Luneburg came, and on the twenty-fourth the margrave George of Brandenburg. At this time the rest of the Evangelical estates of the empire, with those who had been sent from the imperial cities, had collected. Luther, who was under the ban of the imperial edict issued at Worms, had to remain behind at Coburg. But the famous theologians, whom the Evangelical princes were to bring with them, did not fail to attend. Along with Melancthon was Justus Jonas, Dr. Urban Regius, Dr. Stephen Agricola, M. George Spalatin, M. John Agricola, or Eisleben, Andrew Osiander, John Brentius, John Rurer, Adam Weis, Martin Moglin, Dr. Schnepf, Dr. Ordinger, Dr. Henry Boeck, and others. Among the princely counsellors were particularly observed the Saxon chancellors Brück and Bayer, and the margraves Vogler and Heller. Equally numerous with the Evangelical, were the Catholic princes and estates; and there was great reason for the remarks which Luther made in his letter to Cordatus, on the sixth of July: "I am exceedingly gratified that I have lived to the present hour, in which Christ is proclaimed by his own confessors so illustrious, in so large an assembly, and in a public Confession so very beautiful. And that Scripture is fulfilled, 'I will declare thy testimonies in the presence of kings,' and this will be fulfilled also which is spoken by one, who does not speak falsely: 'He who shall confess me before men, him will I confess before my Father, who is in heaven.'"

When the diet had commenced, there were numerous difficulties to be encountered. On the evening of the arrival of the Emperor, he summoned the four princes of Saxony, Brandenburg, Luneburg, and Hesse, to a private audience, and he enjoined it upon them to forbid the theologians, who had attended them to Augsburg, to preach there. Here the Register of the messengers of Nuremberg reports in reference to this matter, that the landgrave of Hesse spoke for the Evangelical party as well as he could, on the subject of preaching; and when king Ferdinand, in the French language, pressed the subject in the presence of his royal majesty, the Emperor would pay no regard to his entreaties, and indeed manifested signs of indignation, intimating to them, through his brother the king, that he would persist in the injunction, and desiring them to understand what it was their duty to do. Then George the margrave boldly declared, that before he would yield this doctrine, and the Word of God, the Emperor must take off his head; and the princes for the present could obtain nothing more than a hearing, namely, to give the Emperor a further answer in reference to this matter on the next day, at the early hour of six. That the heroism of the margrave George, which acquired for him the honorable surname of Confessor, made a favorable impression upon the Emperor, is obvious from the conciliating reply of the Emperor, reported by others: "Lion prince! head not off, head not off." But it came, however, only to this, that the Emperor finally forbade both parties to preach, and only granted occasional permission to such ecclesiastics as those to whom he himself should have expressly granted the privilege. In the second place, it was an earnest desire of the Emperor, that the Evangelical princes should take part in the festival of Corpus Christi, about to take place the following day: but this likewise was so pertinaciously refused by the margrave George, that king Ferdinand

wept with indignation. On the other hand, the Emperor refused, equally determined not to let the Confession of the Evangelical party be read or delivered to him at the general diet.

For while the members of the diet were convened in the forenoon of Saturday, the twenty-fifth of June, and after an address of the Pope's legate in reference to the religious difficulties, and the movements of the Turks, after hearing likewise a message from the Low Countries in the east, praying for assistance against the Turks, the princes of Saxony, Brandenburg, Lunenburg, and Hesse, who together with the imperial cities of Nuremberg and Reitlingen, had subscribed to this Confession on the twenty-third, appeared with the instrument in their hands, and Dr. Brück, in their name, entreated the Emperor to permit it to be read aloud, it appeared as if this request, so just and reasonable in itself, and of so much importance to the Evangelical party, would never be granted. The Register above referred to, relates the interesting proceedings, in which the Confession of the Evangelical party finally vanquished, through the assistance of God, in so perspicuous a manner, that we cannot avoid quoting several remarkable passages here: "His majesty, after the conference with the elector and princes, at first absolutely refused this request, and peremptorily required the Confession to be presented to him; and when the princes who made the application, continued to agitate the matter, observing that necessity imperiously required it, because it greatly concerned themselves, the salvation of their souls, their honor, and their reputation; that they must also stand before his royal highness in a very disreputable light, and, in other respects, as they might credibly conclude, as having suffered unbecoming doctrine and opinions to be disseminated in his provinces; on account of this it would be necessary for their defence to be publicly heard,—his imperial majesty refused again, but the elector and the princes continued to press the matter, the third time, and with the greatest submission, entreated him for God's sake to suffer the Confession to be read here publicly. For nothing had been written in it except what necessity demanded, and no one was assailed with abuse. Then his imperial majesty caused them to be informed, a third time, that he felt inclined to grant their request, but as it had become late, it was his desire, that their electoral and princely graces would deliver the Confession to his imperial majesty, and that he would hear it at two o'clock in the afternoon, in the palace, in the presence of the elector, the princes, and estates.

"On the other hand, the elector and princes caused it again to be intimated, that it was their principal desire for his majesty and the estates to hear their Confession, with the further request, were it not agreeable to him at this time, that he, at the appointed hour at which he had proposed to hear them at the palace, appear again at the council chamber, and permit their manuscript to be read there, suffering them to retain it in order to review and correct it, as it had been drawn up in haste. His highness persisted in the determination of hearing it at the palace, but was willing to permit the elector and princes to retain the manuscript till that hour; and to this the princes had to submit.

"At three in the afternoon, the Confession was subscribed by the elector of Saxony and the other princes, and likewise by the representatives of

Nuremburg and Reitlingen. It was first read from a German copy by the Saxon chancellor, in a clear and audible voice, so that all who attended might understand it, and then delivered in Latin and German to his imperial majesty, in presence of the king, the elector, the princes, and estates assembled at the palace. Thereupon his majesty, after some consultation with the other electors and princes, caused it to be said by duke Frederick to the elector of Saxony and his attendants, that his imperial majesty had heard the Confession, and because the due consideration of it would be tedious, involving matters of the greatest importance, necessity required his majesty to reflect maturely upon it, and to take counsel; that his imperial majesty would do so; that he would examine it thoroughly as became his Christian character; in this determination he would persist, and that he would grant the aforementioned elector and princes another hearing. This answer, and especially the gracious audience which had been promised, drew from the elector and his attendants, the warmest expressions of gratitude towards his majesty, the king, the electors, princes, and estates, pledging their humble services and obligations in the most respectful terms. And they also promised, if his imperial majesty should further direct, that they would submissively appear, and, by virtue of his majestic edict, faithfully observe and perform every duty, not only in reference to this matter, but also in reference to all the business of the diet.

"Afterwards his imperial majesty addressed the elector and princes in private, and entreated them to keep the manuscript which had been read with themselves, and not have it published; and they promised to have this attended to."

That which was aimed at from the first as an apology, became a confession. In consequence of its apologetic design, Melanchthon had at first named it Apology; but it must be remarked that it ought to be much rather called a Confession. In the reports of the delegates of Nuremburg, other appellations still appear: they speak of it as a Proposal or Proposition, and as the Saxon Abstract or Report. For it was originally the intention, that each Evangelical estate of the empire should hand over their own written statement, but the margrave George advised that they should all unite in one general Confession, and they received Melanchthon's Apology as such a Confession, which from that time on account of its great importance, and the place where it was delivered, was called the Augsburg Confession. In later times, during the controversy with the Jesuits, it was distinguished by the name of the Evangelical Apple of the eye, (Prov. 7, 2,) in consequence of the high importance which the Evangelical church attributed to it.

And lastly it still remains to mention, that the Emperor himself took both copies of the Confession, which the chancellor Brück, after they had been read, wished to deliver to the imperial secretary, Alexander Schweiss; and he kept the Latin copy himself, and transferred the one in German to the elector of Mentz as chancellor of the empire, to be deposited in the archives of the government. In this manner the Latin copy of the Confession came into the archives at Brussels, whence the duke of Albo afterwards carried it with him to Spain.

Our gratitude is due to the determinate resolution of the elector of Saxony, that the Confession was read in the German language, when the emperor, not without design, wished the Latin text to be read. For the elec-

stor is said to have cried out, that they were on German ground, in a German land, and he hoped the Emperor would not refuse to hear the German copy. At the same time the Evangelical party asserted, that the Latin copy had been written in so much haste, that it would be very difficult to read.

2. *Its Nature, its Composition, and Design.*—The Confession of Augsburg, as we have already observed, comprises the three manuscripts which had been consigned to Melancthon, for the purpose of being revised and formed into one system. From these three manuscripts arose the two parts of the Confession,—the first of which, consisting of twenty-one articles, on the Faith and the Doctrines of the Evangelical party, and the second, consisting of seven articles, on Abuses which are there corrected, are drawn up in a clear, artless, firm, and elegant style, wholly in accordance with the Scriptures. On each of these articles Melancthon solicited the opinions of the rest of the theologians; the Preface and Conclusion were added by chancellor Brück. It is said that the Latin text, without the preface, however, and the conclusion, and without the twentieth article, was finished some time before the German copy, and that this text alone was sent to Luther. We find, indeed, in the Register of the 14th of June, this remark: “The Saxon Abstract of the articles of Faith composed in German, is to be ascribed to the Nuremberg delegates, yet without a Preface or a Conclusion, and as Philip Melancthon undertook to revise it, he did not wish to attach any Preface or Conclusion of his own to it in German, as he believed that the Preface and Conclusion ought to be composed not only in the name of the elector, but in that of all the Lutheran princes and estates; and while he made alterations in the articles in German, namely, where it is said in the Latin text that this or that was preached or maintained by the Saxon electors, in the German he has left out *Saxon electors*, and substituted a general term, which is equally applicable to all the estates.” But this German copy, which the delegates of Nuremberg sent home on the fifteenth, whilst they could have already on the third of June transmitted the Latin copy, is complete; and we have a German manuscript, in which the preface, the conclusion, and the twentieth article also, are wanting. Thus it appears that the German text was completed, soon after the completion of the Latin probably, but certainly after it. We believe indeed that we are able to adduce a more positive evidence, that both copies were transmitted to Luther at Coburg. On the sixteenth of May, according to the Register, “the delegates of Nuremberg asked of the Saxon chancellor, what his grace desired to discuss at this diet in reference to subjects relating to religion? He answered that it was in reference to a proposition concerning this Article, first sketched here at Augsburg, in order that it be written out in German and Latin, but that it was still unfinished, having been sent in order that Luther might revise it; that in a few days it would be returned, not to be withheld from them, but to be sent back.” If it should be objected that the delegates on sending a draft in Latin, write, “if the Proposition be brought into German, the draft would also become manifest;” we need only assume that they mean the German Confession in its complete state; for the draft, according to the testimony of the Saxon chancellor, was completed already on the 16th of May. It appears too, by the testimony already adduced from the above particulars of the 14th of June, that the German Confession

was nevertheless, though independent, a translation from the original Latin text, improved by Melancthon, which, however, may serve no less for a true original; because Melancthon, after he had completed the Latin text, by the addition of a Preface, Conclusion, and the twentieth article, with all diligence applied himself to the improvement of the German text. Melancthon himself was afraid that Luther would not approve his numerous alterations, which gradually gave to the original draft quite a different form. "I have rendered the Preface of our Confession somewhat more rhetorical than that which I had written at Coburg," he writes to Luther on the fourth of May; and on the twenty-second of the same month: "I am making many alterations every day in the Apology. I wish you would glance over the articles of faith. If you think there is nothing wrong in them, I will know better how to complete the rest. For they must be gradually changed and accommodated to changing circumstances." And on the day after the delivery of the Confession, he writes to Comerarins, that he had altered and improved the chief parts every day, and that he would have made still greater alterations, if his counsellors had permitted him; so that he had good reason, on transmitting a copy, after the exemplar delivered for Luther, to write to bishop Dietrich: "I desire to know what the doctor thinks of my Apology."

So long as Melancthon was preparing this Confession for his lord, the elector, he was under less restrictions in reference to these alterations. But when other princes and estates had come with their theologians, with writings on the same subjects to the diet, and had agreed to present a general Confession, and even this of Melancthon's, which we believe was completed in the first week in June, then the several articles had to be settled in general council, and established in repeated conferences. And hence says Melancthon with great reason: "I have assumed nothing on my own authority, each sentence and each article being discussed in order by the princes and other rulers and advisers, who were present."

Thus we distinctly perceive that the existing manuscripts or copies deposited in archives, differ widely from each other. There appear to be nine Latin manuscripts, twelve German, and one in French. The Latin copies are—1. The Hessian, in the public archives, at the castle of the elector of Hesse, together with another Latin, a German, and a French manuscript, brought home from the diet by the landgrave Philip; Forsteman distinguished it with this epithet properly enough, and though it occupied the second place among the public copies, we have introduced it first, because it manifestly contains the Confession in its original form, that is, nothing but a system of faith under the title "Chief Articles of Faith." 2. The Dessauian manuscript, in the general archives of Anhalt, brought home from the diet by prince Wolf. It has neither Title, Preface, nor Conclusion. 3. The manuscript of Regensburg, among the public documents of the cathedral; this manuscript, Gemeiner, the keeper of the archives, in a public document of 1817, would give, though with great inaccuracy, the authority of an authentic copy from the original text. It is written in two different hands, and has numerous corrections from copyists and other causes. 4. The manuscript of Wurtsburg, in the archives of Wurtsburg. This agrees, like the foregoing one of Regensburg, mostly with the text of Fabricius, and both belong to an earlier date, when the Confession

was first completed in the draft. 5. The manuscript of Anspach, in the archives of Nuremberg, belonging to the public records of Brandenburg, brought from the diet by the margrave George, together with three German manuscripts of the same. It is entire, its principal differences being in the article concerning the vows of the monks, where the words are omitted from "the Canons teach in every vow," to "are exposed to the eyes of men;" and in the article concerning the power of the church, a considerable addition appears, which, however, we still may notice in the oldest impression. From an examination of this manuscript, we can defend Forsteman against Weber, that the preface very probably was written at the same time with this text. The ink is not faded more, and both the leaves upon which the preface is written belong to the whole fold of the paper, and to both sheets on which the other part of the controverted article is written. 6. The manuscript of Hussia. It is the first manuscript in the volume of records, containing numerous corrections, and agrees in general with the first Latin impression. 7. The Hanoverian manuscript, in the archives of Hanover, brought by duke Ernst of Luneburg from the diet, with a German manuscript. It is complete, yet almost illegible in consequence of the numerous corrections. 8. The manuscript of Nuremberg, in the archives of Nuremberg, excepting the want of the antitheses in articles thirteenth and eighteenth, agrees with the quarto edition by Melancthon, in 1531. It has apparently many corrections, and, a circumstance of some importance, the names of seven princes subscribed. 9. The manuscript of Weimar, in the public records of the General History at Weimar. It is found in the records of the convent of Naumburg, 1561, and was written at that time, as Weber and Forsteman have proved. It agrees with the quarto edition of Melancthon of 1531, word for word, although the antitheses in articles thirteen and eighteen are wanting.

The French translation of the Augsburg Confession appears in the archives of the elector at Cassel, and was inserted in the volume of public records with a Latin and German manuscript. Like the first Anspach German manuscript, it wants the preface and the controverted articles; on the other hand, it contains the article concerning the invocation of saints, and thus resembles the Spalatin manuscript. It is quite probable that this is a translation of that manuscript, concerning which, on the 28th of May, 1530, the delegates of Nuremberg wrote to their lords: "The Report, that is, the Augsburg Confession, was composed in Latin, German, and French." The author, no doubt, was Tucher of Nuremberg, who by order of the elector of Saxony, at that time translated into French a copy of instructions to be delivered to the Emperor. On the authority of Forsteman, it had nothing to do with the translation of the imperial secretary, Schweiss.

The German manuscripts are the following:—1. That of Spalatin, in the archives of Weimar. It is in Spalatin's own hand-writing, without the Preface, and concludes with the third part of the article concerning monastic vows, beginning with the commencement of the article. Among all manuscripts this exhibits the Confession in the most ancient form. 2. That of Anspach. It wants the Preface, the twentieth and twenty-first articles, and likewise the controverted articles. It still, however, agrees in its details more with the manuscript of Spalatin, than with later ones. Though it exhibits variations from the former, which are wanting in the

latter, and thus it seems to occupy a kind of medium position between the two. 3. That of Hanover. This contained the Confession, originally, only from the first to the nineteenth article, entirely corresponding with the foregoing, together with the Conclusion, and the Introduction to the controverted articles, and then, the Preface, together with the twentieth and twenty-first articles, was written, and the controverted articles were added, by a different hand, and the necessary alterations in the first draft were introduced by the same hand, yet in so careless a manner, that the writer forgot to strike out the Conclusion to the articles of faith and the Introduction to the controverted articles after the nineteenth article, but added to this Introduction the twentieth and twenty-first articles which were wanting, and introduced the Conclusion and Introduction again. 4. That of Hessa. It contains corrections from a hand, if not contemporary indeed, but little later. It is complete, and corresponds almost entirely with that of Anspach. 5. That of Nuremberg. It exhibits numerous instances of conformity with those of Weimar, Anspach, and Hanover, more especially, however, with the copy in the records of Mentz; and contains the names of eight princes subscribed. 6. That of Munich, in the public archives of Munich. It shows a strict correspondence with later manuscripts in their complete form. It frequently adds the text from the leading edition of Melancthon, and is remarkable on account of some peculiar readings, ending however, with the article concerning the Mass, in the words, *für andre Lebendigen und Todten*. 7. That of Weimar. It is only a copy of a copy, agreeing mostly with the above manuscript of Mentz; it contains readings, however, which occur in the oldest impressions, and in the *Editio Princeps*. 8. That of Nordlingen, in the public archives of Nordlingen. It betrays deficiencies which characterize it as an incorrect transcript, and agrees in general with the Augsburg manuscript, and the impression of Oberland. 9. That of Augsburg, in the library at Augsburg. It agrees with that of Nordlingen, and also with the copy of Oberland, and especially with the last; so that it appears, both have originated from the same source. 10. The second manuscript at Anspach. This is, incontestably, a very important manuscript. It agrees with that in the public records at Mentz; it exhibits corrections, however, in which the original readings are changed, and those inserted which occur in other manuscripts, and in the *Editio Princeps*. These corrections, with few exceptions, are written by the same hand, and they may be a still greater evidence, that this manuscript was compared with the original copy, as it was used in the judicial transactions of the committee of the Evangelical and Roman Catholic parties, at the Diet. From the most positive evidence we can declare, that this very manuscript affords us the text of the Augsburg Confession, in a form which exhibits the highest degree of conformity with that which was delivered to the Emperor. The variations from the original seem to consist mostly in differences of orthography among the writers; as to the text, no further variations appear. "With all propriety this manuscript may be used as a ground for a new edition of the Augsburg Confession." This is the opinion of Forsteman, which we cannot vouch for, without an actual inspection of the manuscript. 11. The third manuscript of Anspach. Weber calls this merely a transcript of the foregoing manuscript, by the same hand, in which his corrections are introduced into the text. Forste-

man opposes this; and we can agree with him too, from our own comparison of both manuscripts. If Forsteman is right, as we believe, this manuscript stands pre-eminent among them all, and nothing should prevent us from declaring it a true copy of the original. 12. The copy from the records of Mentz, from which the text of the Book of Concord has been usually taken, because it was long regarded as the original itself, although it is nothing but a copy, and, more than this, a defective one.

Before we describe how this copy attained the unmerited honor of furnishing the text for the Book of Concord, we must make some necessary remarks concerning the first publication of the Confession, because the history of this, especially of the so-called *Editio Variata*, shows us why recourse was had, in the compilation of the Book of Concord, to a manuscript of the Confession, in preference to Melancthon's editions.

As remarked above, the Emperor ordered the Evangelical party not to publish the Confession, and these had promised to obey. But without the knowledge or consent of these men, there appeared even during the diet, and immediately after the conclusion of it, seven different editions, six in German and one in Latin, and indeed, as was natural enough, without mentioning the place of publication or betraying the printer, the publisher, or the editor. They were all published from one manuscript; the first four German editions were published in the Swiss dialect; the fifth in the dialect of Lower Saxony; the sixth in the high German dialect. They differ but little from each other. The first four abound in typographical errors, the fifth, and more especially the sixth, are more correct. The Latin publication, in its peculiarities, approaches the manuscript of Anspach, and has likewise numerous typographical errors, from which it is evident that the publisher knew very little about Latin.

The want of authenticity in these publications, caused Melancthon, as he says himself, in his Latin preface, not indeed from the positive order of the elector, and yet not without his previous knowledge, to issue a publication of the Latin and German text. This edition has the following title: "Confession of Faith, exhibited to the invincible emperor, Charles Augustus, at the Diet of Augsburg, 1530; to which is added the Apology of the Confession, both in German and Latin." And at the end,—“Printed by George Rhan, 1531.” From this last date, we must not conclude, that this edition first appeared in 1531. 1. Because Melancthon says in the preface to his *Editio Princeps* concerning that first publication: “It was published two months before, by some speculating typographer.” 2. Because the date, 1531, is not applicable to the publication of the Confession, but to that of the Apology. The Confession was published, and in circulation, before the publication of the Apology. 3. Because we learn from a letter of Pistorius, dated, Nidda, 18th of January, 1561, addressed to the landgrave Philip, on the occasion of the Naumburg Convention, where the princes wished to subscribe to the authentic copy of the Confession: “Since I have heard that your princely grace has sought, with so much diligence, for a copy of the Augsburg Confession, corresponding with the one delivered to his imperial majesty, in 1530, in order to provide against our adversaries, who keep circulating the injurious report, that we have no longer the Confession which was delivered to the Emperor; and since I have two copies, one in Latin and one in German, of the very first edition in

quarto, printed at Wittenburg, and brought to the Diet at Augsburg: these copies I transmit to you, which I received of Dr. Brück, and which agree in every respect with the manuscript delivered to his imperial majesty."

This publication was designed to present both texts united in one copy, though they both at the same time can be separated in such a manner, that comparative forms of examples can be viewed at pleasure. More numerous editions of this text rapidly succeeded each other, the diversities of which are mentioned by Feuerlein, Riederer, Weber, and Dr. Kaiser, in his invaluable Monography, supplementary to a critical literary history of the original copy of Melancthon's Augsburg Confession and the Apology in Latin and German, Nuremberg, 1830. Concerning the formation of this text, Melancthon says in the preface of his publication, "that he himself prepared it from a copy of great authenticity." Now if it is uncertain whether these words have reference to the Latin only, or to the Latin and German both, it is still more uncertain, what amendments Melancthon had already proposed in this first publication, whether he proposed any, and in what relation his text stands to that delivered to the Emperor. Both of these very important inquiries it may be our duty in this place to answer. 1. The words which we have quoted from the preface, have reference only to the Latin text; for of this translation Melancthon had his draft no longer, which, in consequence of the great haste, in a very immature state was delivered to the Emperor; thus he must have used as a basis one of the copies finished before the delivery. Indeed of the German text, he still had the draft in his own hands. 2. In the Latin text Melancthon made very little alteration, of which assertion the readings furnish abundant evidence, as well as the silence of the archbishop Lindanus, who, in his calumnious work on the discrepancies in the Concordia, 1583, reproaches the German text, and the later Latin publications, as being altered, but not the Latin *Editio Princeps*; and in reference to this matter, Lindanus was the best qualified to judge, for he had himself seen the Latin draft in the archives of Brussels. The German text, however, was diligently revised by Melancthon, and frequently changed, not only in words and in their location, but the twentieth, twenty-seventh, and twenty-eighth articles, were nearly entirely remodelled. Viewed apart from particular instances, of which we shall speak hereafter, we are convinced that our text in the Book of Concord approaches much nearer the original copy which was delivered to the Emperor, than does the *Editio Princeps* of Melancthon. For,—1. The best manuscripts, especially the second of Anspach, are favorable to our text, whilst all seem to be unfavorable to that of Melancthon. 2. It cannot be admitted that not even one of these manuscripts, not the third of Anspach itself, according to this text of Melancthon, if it were that delivered to the Emperor, might have been corrected. 3. There was not a sufficient length of time to write the draft of the Latin text in its purity, nor to make such important extensions in the German text, which would have rendered it necessary to transcribe the whole of it. 4. Melancthon himself says, that his counsellors had forbidden him to make any further alterations; that he had improvements in readiness, which he was not suffered to apply; so that he seized the first opportunity which presented, to accomplish what still seemed requisite, and this was the publication of the

Confession. 5. Our text leaves, if prejudice could be laid aside, the impression of originality, while the text of the *Editio Princeps* is much more labored, more profound, and more refined.

In reference, however, to the names subscribed to the Confession, those of the *Editio Princeps* alone are to be regarded as historically correct. For Melancthon must certainly have known who subscribed the Confession, and he could neither have added to, nor taken from it, a single name without incurring public reprehensions. But the subscribers of the *Editio Princeps* continued to be correct up to the year 1572, when an edition at Brandenburg, according to a collation by Cœlestin and Zoch, appeared with a catalogue of false names, which were afterwards transferred into the German edition of the Book of Concord. The latter is justified by the circumstance, that the elector Frederick and duke Franz subscribed the Latin copy of the Confession, as the more important one, but not the German copy, because they were not then in the exercise of any civil office. This is an argument afterwards contrived, and proves nothing, as such a difference between the two copies was never made. In relation to the *Editio Princeps* it may still further be said, to view it apart from its correspondence with the Latin copy and the manuscripts, that no objection was made in this respect to it, at the Convention in Naumburg in 1561, where Philip, landgrave of Hesse, was then still present, and farther that Lindanus seems to remember nothing of any such occurrence.

These alterations by Melancthon in the quarto edition of 1531, which was soon after succeeded by the still more altered octavo edition of 1531 and 1538 in Latin, and then in German, 1533 and 1536, excited no farther attention, since they only affected the composition and the style, but by no means made any innovation upon the Lutheran doctrine. For, although Wigand, with some plausibility, says in reference to the first octavo edition: "Some time after, in the same year, another edition appeared in octavo form, which Melancthon, without consulting others, began to change in several places, introducing injurious alterations as well as good,"—yet we have a more certain evidence for the contrary, in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession: "In the first ten years, that is, from 1530 to 1540, no alteration appeared which could be regarded as serious in reference to any real doctrines, or points affecting our articles of faith." Melancthon indeed, as the alterations themselves prove, was entirely and exclusively influenced by the desire to bring that Evangelical system of truth, so gloriously acknowledged at Augsburg, still nearer perfection, to defend it always with still greater zeal and energy, on which account it has come to pass, that at that time this Confession and Apology were always regarded as the general Confession, but by no means as Symbolic Writings, in our sense of that term. But the matter assumed a different aspect, when in the year 1540, a new Latin quarto edition, by George Rhau, appeared, which presents the tenth article,—concerning the Lord's Supper,—in the following words: "Respecting the Lord's Supper, they teach, that the body and blood of Christ are represented with bread and wine to those who participate in that sacrament;" whereas in its original form it read thus: "Respecting the Lord's Supper, they teach, that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, and are distributed to those who participate in the Lord's Supper, and the learned likewise approve it." This al-

teration was, in every sense, a deviation from the Lutherian doctrine of the Lord's Supper, and an approach towards the Calvinistic doctrine, which article, when so rendered, can be conveniently explained in accordance with his doctrine; as Calvin, in 1557, writes to M. Schelling: "I do not reject the Augsburg Confession, but I willingly and cheerfully would subscribe it with the explanation of the author himself." But that which the Calvinist would regard merely as an interpretation, elucidation, indeed, as it would naturally seem to him, an improvement, the Lutheran must view as a dangerous and unwarrantable perversion of his Confession of Faith: and, indeed, this is evident from the attack of Eck upon Melancthon at the colloquy at Worms, 1541, where the altered copy of 1540 was brought forward, and equally evident must it be from the further history of the Lutheran church. At this colloquy Melancthon at last was obliged to discontinue his reference to the altered edition, and the elector, John Frederick of Saxony, declared, "that he was determined to disregard the new edition, and adhere only to the original." From this we may be assured, that the elector could not sanction these alterations of the Confession; besides the elector had before this time taken umbrage at the frequent alterations made by Melancthon. For Luther, during the session of the Convention at Smalcald, said to the princes who visited him in his illness: "After my death, dissensions will arise in the university of Wittenburg, and my doctrines will be altered." The elector took this so deeply to heart, that immediately after the recovery of Luther, on the fifth of May he came to Wittenburg, and intimated to Luther and Bugenhagen, through the chancellor Brück, that he did not like to hear that Melancthon and Creuziger employed modes of expression, in the articles of Justification and Good Works, different from those of Luther; that Melancthon indeed, in editing the Augsburg Confession, had taken upon himself the responsibility, without consulting his friends, to alter several words,—a thing which he should not have done. "These alterations taking place now," said the elector in a prophetic spirit, "what will occur, Dr. Martin, when we both close our eyes! Our oldest prince is still a child, and our brother is yet young, and there is a great deficiency in competent men." Much less could he call the variations good; and indeed Brück had to speak in reference to this matter, with Melancthon, at the request of the elector, and make him acquainted with that nobleman's dissatisfaction. In the General History of the Doctrines of the Protestants, by Weber and Planck, the evidences may be seen which have been employed to refute the foregoing assertions. But although both these allow no weight to these assertions, and especially wish to make it appear, that Luther was aware of the alterations of Melancthon, not viewing them simply with silence, but even *sanctioning* them, yet this would be an assertion against which many evidences can be adduced, in all respects claiming our attention. For the evidence of Wigand is worthy of remark, who says: "I heard from George Rorarius, that Dr. Luther said to Melancthon,—Philip! Philip! you are not doing right, in altering the Augustan Confession so often; for it does not belong to you, but to the church." And this was far from being a Flacian tale, as Planck would represent it; indeed the theologians of Jena had made the assertion, at the colloquy in Altenburg, held in 1568, without contradiction, by their opponents. Schnecker and Chytrous, who at first had expressed

a favorable opinion of the alterations of Melancthon, signed the report addressed to the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, dated March 15, 1578, in which it is said, that the Augsburg Confession was altered, by the advice, consent, and recommendation of the devout Dr. Luther, as the alteration was undertaken and accomplished during his life. This cannot be vindicated by the authority of any theologian; for it is true that there were several still living, who could vouch that no alteration of the Augsburg Confession, or of the *Locorum Communium*, met the approbation of Dr. Luther. And that this is the general view of the subject, is proved especially by the important declaration of the Reformed theologian, John G. Vossius, against Hugo Grotius, who asserts that the Belgic Confession might well be altered, because the same had been done with the Augsburg Confession. Vossius writes to him: "You say that the Augustan Confession has been changed. I know not whether that is of any great consequence, since it was altered by the private judgment of Melancthon, but, if I am not deceived, it was never altered by public authority. This one thing at least I know, that Melancthon was frequently reproached by Luther, for doing this without seeking the counsel of others. I know also that the princes of Germany, who adhere to the Augustan Confession, acknowledge no other except that exhibited to Charles V. in 1530." It is true that no public declaration of Luther's upon this point has come down to us, but it is quite sufficient for us to know what is said in the Apology for the Augsburg Confession, that Luther had by no means approved the interference of Melancthon, but to avoid offence he at first had said nothing publicly respecting it, until finally he determined to write against it, when in the name of the elector, he was entreated by chancellor Brück: "Again to admonish Melancthon in a friendly manner, and if he would not listen then, to make all the efforts in his power, and, in the name of God, to do his utmost to preserve the purity of our holy doctrines." But that Luther hesitated so much to act in opposition to Melancthon publicly, although he complained of him in letters to his friends, should not surprise us. If indeed he had so long regarded Melancthon as a true and active co-laborer, to whom he himself, to whom the church, owed so much gratitude, might he not hope to win him back by gentle and soothing admonitions, and dissuade him from these dangerous and pernicious innovations?

There is moreover, in the church, the edition of the Latin Confession of 1540, which was particularly said to be altered, or called *Variata*, while the earlier impressions, and the German copies, were not included under this title, this copy having obtained at no time any considerable repute. At the time when the Cryptocalvinists prevailed, it succeeded indeed in moving even the princes opposed to it, at the Convention of Naumburg in 1561, to a partial acknowledgment of the so-called *Variata*, as "this was somewhat more fully carried out in consequence of the Papists, and given over and used in the religious discussions and disputes at Worms in 1540, and at several other places." The *Editio Princeps*, however, was the only one subscribed and sealed. No doubt the Evangelical party, at the Diet of Augsburg in 1559, were distressed in consequence of these discrepancies, charged upon them by their opponents, and they proved, in their Protestation of May 1st, that they all unanimously persevered in maintaining the Confession delivered in 1530, and acknowledged exclusively in the Formula of

Concord, the first unaltered Augsburg Confession, and by this acknowledgment, they denied all authority, in the church expressly, to every other edition.

When contentions arose,—the foundation of which the alterations of Melancthon had laid, and by which, especially after his death, his adherents distracted, to a lamentable extent, the Lutheran church; when it became necessary, for the protection of the doctrines of the church, to embody the Symbolic Writings into a system of doctrine, then it also became an object of deep solicitude, to recover the true text of the Confession delivered at Augsburg. Now where was this to be found, if not in the archives of Mentz? With this view, the elector Joachim II. of Brandenburg, at first sent in company with the archbishop Sigismund of Magdeburg, in the year 1566, the court chaplain, George Cœlestin, and the counsellor, Andrew Zoch, to Mentz, for the purpose of collating the original found there. The same thing occurred in 1576, by order of the elector August of Saxony, and the German text recovered by these two collations has been introduced into the Book of Concord. In this they believed they had the true original, and by virtue of the official testimony of the chancellors of Mentz, they could believe nothing else. Pfaff, the chancellor of Tübingen, was the first to excite a doubt on this subject. During his residence in Swalbach in 1729, he had an opportunity to seek for the original in the public archives of that place, but it could not be found, and he declared the copy found in the Register, which is called Protocol, to be the original, after the above-mentioned collations were made. The assertion of Pfaff, however, received the less credit, as in a short time after this, Feuerlein, a member of the consistory, made known the declaration of Gudenus, the assessor of the judicial court, from which it becomes evident that the German as well as the Latin original, still exists entire in the archives. Feuerlein has even described the external appearance of the German copy, as being a book in small quarto form, bound in black leather, with red edges; and from this, the duchess dowager of Weimar, who, at the instance of Seidler, the chief counsellor of the consistory, had asked for a transcript of the authentic text, received an accredited transcript as a copy of the true original. Weber, the minister of the collegiate church, had this printed, and as it presented a text quite different from that of the Book of Concord, it could not escape various assaults from every side. In this exigency, Weber was induced to search the archives himself, and found to his astonishment, that the text which he had published was a copy of the edition of 1540, which Griesbach had already indicated, in his critical dissertations. It is really astonishing, that the civil council could presume to call this printed copy an original, while on the very title of it, “Wittenburg 1540” appeared! The further researches of Weber were attended with similar results. The original copy delivered to the emperor Charles, in 1539, had long since disappeared; and very probably it was sent, with other public documents, to Trent in 1546, and had not been returned. The investigations which took place in the year 1566 and 1576, were conducted in accordance with a transcript, which Weber discovered, under the name of Protocol. From this it is perceived, that Cœlestin, upon whose authority the credibility of the German and Latin text of the Confession, received into the Book of Concord, principally depends, was either dishonest, or at least very insincere.

"This Latin text, which he wishes to consider the original from the one preserved at Mentz, which indeed was never there, is a reprint of the one published by Fabrieius, and his German text is merely a transcript of the Protocol above mentioned; and yet he and the civil counsellors published it as a copy of the original. In addition to this, it also appeared that this Protocol had no subscribers at all, although Cælestin exhibits some names, yet not the full number.

Hence it is to be inferred, that our text in the Book of Concord by no means presents that of the true original. Indeed we are obliged to acknowledge still further, that it has been taken from a copy of the Confession, which has no small number of errors, namely, typographical errors, omissions, and transposition of sentences. Still, however, it can by no argument be established, that this copy in the legal documents of Mentz, is not a transcript from the original deposited in the chancery of the empire, the errors of which are not so much to be ascribed to the original, as to the carelessness and negligence of copyists, though we perhaps should find it improbable, as in that case the names of the signers should have accompanied the text. At least it cannot be denied that this text corresponds most closely with the best manuscripts, and that its errors might easily be corrected from that copy, and from the *Editio Princeps*: so that we have no reason to remove the text received by the church, and to introduce another in its place, when we cannot be certain that it approaches any nearer to the original copy. We appeal here to what was said above of the reception of this text in relation to the substance of the *Editio Princeps*, and to the specification of the various readings. With great cheerfulness we acknowledge the value and the excellence of Weber's work, yet we cannot entirely exculpate him from partiality. He takes no pains to conceal it, that he is an avowed enemy of the Formula of Concord. By this disposition he has exercised no small influence on many, and numbers have permitted themselves to be led into error by him. He has endeavored to invalidate the authority of the Book of Concord, and as much as possible abused the text received by the church.

3. *Its Authority and Importance.*—Luther called the Diet at Augsburg, "The last trumpet before the Last Day;" so might we, with equal propriety, denominate the Testimony which was presented there, the sound of this trumpet, which, because it proclaims the pure Gospel of God, has indeed, like the Gospel itself, Rom. 10. 18, extended into every land. The Emperor himself sent it to numerous princes, and to the university at Lowen, for the purpose of ascertaining their opinions on these subjects. His secretary, Alexander Schweiss, translated it into French, and Alpheus Valdasius into the Spanish language. The cardinal Campegius translated it into the Italian language, for the convenience of the Pope, who did not understand much Latin. Foreign delegates caused other translations to be made for their particular courts. Thus the calumniations, which had continued to pour upon the Evangelical party, now experienced the most powerful opposition, and their Confession could now be best defended in the open light of the public mind.

A perusal of the Confession made the deepest and most favorable impression. The Emperor did not express his opinion publicly indeed in reference to this Confession; and no one could expect a free expression of

his internal convictions, because such an expression would not have been consistent with his civil policy. But he did hear the clear sound of the Gospel; and the fact, that he strove to retain both copies of the Confession, that he actually did retain the Latin copy, as well as his strict attention during the two hours of reading the Confession, convinces us that he knew the importance of the subject, and felt the necessity of giving it a mature consideration in private. And though he never appeared friendly to the Reformation, yet there arose after his death a wide and prevailing impression, that he died in the Evangelical faith. His brother, king Ferdinand, conducted himself afterwards with a great deal more moderation towards the Evangelical party: and the reproach, which the Pope on a subsequent occasion, in 1559, endeavored to throw upon him,—that he had his prince Maximilian educated for the most part among the Lutherans,—proves that the Confession of Truth did not waste all its influence on him. Henry, duke of Brunswick, although a bitter enemy to the Lutherans, invited Melancthon to his own table, when he made the declaration, that he could not reject the article concerning the two forms,—the marriage of priests, and the distinction of meats. William, duke of Bavaria, said many friendly things in reference to these subjects, to the elector, and on their return he said, “No one has ever spoken in this manner to me before in reference to these matters and doctrines;” indeed when Eck, on being reminded of his promise to write a confutation of the Confession, said that he could not do so from the Scripture, but from the Fathers he probably could: the duke turned away from him with these words, “Well the Lutherans then are sitting on the Scripture, and we Papists are sitting by the side of it.” Frederick, the count-palatine. Eric of Brunswick. Henry of Mecklenburg, the dukes of Pomerania, George Ernst of Hesseburg, were all convinced of the truth. The cardinal Matthew Long, archbishop of Salzburg, openly declared a conformity of feelings with the articles concerning the Mass, and the article concerning meats and human traditions, with the sole exception of the intolerable circumstance, that a mere monk should undertake a reformation. Other cardinals spoke also to the same effect, and numerous bishops made declarations of a friendly and favorable character, as well as many among the civil princes,—one indeed, very probably Stadion of Augsburg, was heard to say: “This is the pure truth, we cannot deny it;” and he acknowledged, in his introductory discourse during the negotiations for a general pacification, that the Lutherans evidently held no opinions opposed to the articles of the Catholic faith.

These evidences, many more of which might still be adduced, proclaim loudly for the character and high importance of the Augsburg Confession. This Confession victoriously repelled the calumnies which had been heaped upon the Evangelical party, triumphed over prejudices, and overpowered the hostility of many, through the mild but irresistible power of truth. This was by far a more glorious victory, than if the league of the Evangelical princes had subdued the Emperor and every opponent by force of arms. For the Evangelical church herself reaped the greatest blessing resulting from it. The Confession served her as a banner, around which she rallied her true members; it served as a sure foundation, upon which she re-established herself; it served as a wall of defence, not only against the attacks of enemies, but also against the attempts of sectarians and fanatics.

And while the Augustan Confession is to be viewed mainly as an event of its time, and of the ecclesiastical relations under which it was formed, and also as an evidence of the faith of those who lived at that time, just as obvious is its connection with the past and future history of the church,—that it is in harmony with the first Symbols of the church, and at the same time a foundation, upon which the further expansion of the church might take place, without danger of being betrayed again from the Word of God to human traditions, so long as we adhere to its fundamental doctrines.

In the Evangelical Lutheran church, the Confession naturally obtained general authority. It became not only her internal, ecclesiastical, but also her external, political basis, by the religious peace effected at Augsburg, in 1555, and by the treaty of peace made at Westphalia in 1648. Distinct from this is the relation of the German Reformed church. Zwinglius had sent a confession of his own to Augsburg; the cities of Oberland had sent in their *Confessio Tetrapolitana*. After this they neither would nor could embrace the Lutheran Confession. Now when this took place, however, afterwards, they only had reference to the *Variata*, to which the Lutheran church never attributed symbolic authority.

III. THE APOLOGY FOR THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

1. *Its Appellation and Origin*.—Of the impression which the perusal of the Confession produced, we have spoken above. It was like the beams of the sun, one effect of which is to harden, another to soften; but all knew that an adjustment of the differences in regard to faith, was pressingly requisite to the security of the empire. Above all, the Emperor felt the incalculable importance of the period in relation to himself; for the reduction of his political power, his imperial authority in and out of Germany, could be obviated only by a reunion of the dismembered parties. This was still possible; and had the counsels of moderate individuals exerted a due influence upon their opponents: could the ecclesiastical powers have but felt reconciled to the Reformation, in leader and in members,—a reformation imperiously demanded by so many councils, and agitated afresh by a hundred grievances of the German nation,—the western part of Christendom might have continued united; and if only Eck and his associates had kept away from the Diet. For the advice which the Catholic estates, on the 27th of June, in conformity with his instruction, had given to the Emperor,—“To have the Confession of the Evangelical party, examined by intelligent, candid, and moderate men, to adopt what was commensurate with the Gospel, the Word of God, and the Christian church, but what was not so, to confute by the Word of God, and to restore it to the true principles of Christianity,”—could not have been better. At the same time the enquiry should have been pressed upon the Evangelical party, whether they were determined to adhere to the Confession already presented, or whether they had something further to introduce, in order that all might be brought to one determination, and led to pursue the same object. But now commenced the artifices of the Romish theologians, and especially of the Pope’s legates and their subordinates, whose plan it was, not to enter into any further discussions, but to bring these differences to a termination by force.

These men, however, were not successful in their infamous designs, and even the well disposed found but little more success in the accomplishment of their laudable intentions. Indeed it finally came to this result: the Emperor desired a refutation of the Confession to be drawn up in his name, to be read before the elector and his attendants, and afterwards the whole subject to be determined according to his proposition. In consequence of this instruction, the Romish theologians were induced to commence a preparation of this Refutation. Among these the principal was John Eck, who had been created prebendary of Regensburg for king Ferdinand; John Schmidt or Faber, provost of Ofen, and court chaplain of the king; John Cocklaus, court chaplain of duke George; Augustine Marius, the suffragan bishop of Wartzburg; Conrad Wimpina of Frankfort, who composed for Tetzels the Conclusion against Luther; Conrad Colli, prior of the cloister at Köln, who wrote against the marriage of Luther, and on that account was highly applauded by Reuchlein; the monk Medartus, minister of king Ferdinand, whom Erasmus, in his Colloquies, delineates. But it was a long time before they accomplished their work. They brought, it is true, a great number of their controversial writings against Luther and his doctrine, such as individual essays against the Confession; but according to Chytraus, their first draft was so miserable, that it was torn with indignation by the Emperor himself; and five times had it to be revised, before it could be brought to a sufficient degree of accuracy so as to satisfy the Emperor. This was not effected until the third of August, when finally the work, which was called the Confutation, was permitted to be read in the German language, by Alexander Schweiss, the private secretary of the Emperor, before the members of the Diet in session, in the same hall in which the Confession itself had been delivered.

This Confutation was drawn up according to the Latin copy of the Augsburg Confession,—in fact, like that confession, composed in Latin and German at the same time, so that the arguments might be directed against the several articles in order, rejecting some entirely or in part, or such as pleased the writers, approving partially or in full. The testimonies of the Fathers, the decrees of councils, the canons, the traditions, and doctrines of the Romish church, were principally employed as the basis of their arguments, but to the holy Scriptures they appealed very sparingly indeed. They expressed an entire conformity with the first, third, eighth, ninth, sixteenth, seventeenth, eighteenth, and nineteenth articles; they partly accorded with the second, fourth, fifth, sixth, tenth, eleventh, twelfth, thirteenth, fourteenth, and fifteenth articles, with the addition, however, of the specific Romish dogmas concerning original sin, the meritorious nature of good works, of satisfaction, and the canonic statutes, the insufficiency of faith for righteousness, and especially with the addition of transubstantiation to the tenth article, the doctrine of auricular confession to the eleventh article, and the seven sacraments to the thirteenth article. The seventh, twentieth, and twenty-first articles were entirely rejected, and the same fate attended the second part of the Confession concerning abuses, yet, the latter, with the acknowledgment that abuses do exist in the church, especially among the spiritual orders, and that they were not unwilling to have them corrected. At the conclusion the Emperor declared to the Evangelical party, that he now hoped they would all come to an agreement, and, if

not, as protector and guardian of the church, he would be compelled to try some other means.

In the meantime, the Emperor might feel that the Confutation, even in its improved form, still exhibited very numerous blemishes, on account of which, he refused to the Evangelical party the transcript of the Confutation which they solicited, and he would not even receive their Refutation. In compliance with the order of the elector, and some other theologians, who instructed him to prepare an Apology for the Confession, Melancthon composed this Refutation, according to the short sketches of the Confutation which Camerarius had been able to make during the time of its being read before the members of the Diet: and besides these notes, some other writings of the Roman theologians, written in opposition to the Evangelical party, were probably employed. Now when, on the twenty-second of September, the abstract of the resolutions of the Diet was read, and it was there asserted, that the Confession of the Evangelical party had been refuted by the Confutation, the elector of Saxony caused the Apology to be introduced and presented by Brück. Frederick, the count palatine, had already received it, and the Emperor himself had extended his hand to take the manuscript, when king Ferdinand pushed back the hand of the Emperor, whispered into his ear, and induced him to refuse the reception of the instrument.

The first copy of the Apology was composed at the same time in Latin and German. Chytraus was the first who published the Latin text, according to the manuscript of Spalatin; one other manuscript, partly by Spalatin, partly by Melancthon, was discovered in the library at Wolfenbüttel, and earlier still, in the library of the university at Helmstadt, and a third one is contained in the Acts of the diet at Brandenburg. Both the last, Forsteman has made public, and the second indeed, in his new book of Records, page 357, the third, page 485. The first impression of the German text, we find in Celestin's first Augsburg publication of the German text of the Augsburg Confession, 1577, published again in 1597 and in 1633, and after that reprinted in a literary review by Bertram. Forsteman has also given an edition of the manuscript found in the archives at Cassel.

Now when a second abstract of the diet appeared, in harsher language, still making the reiterated assertion, that the Confession had been refuted by the Confutation, necessity itself forcibly impelled its friends to make this unaccepted Apology more generally known. It is true Melancthon had already been thinking of the effort, and he had commenced a revision of the first draft, which however grew into a regular work, and in the middle of April, 1531, it appeared complete in print. The Latin text was composed entirely by Melancthon, but the German by Justus Jonas, is not however a mere translation from the Latin; but as Melancthon himself co-operated in the work, and according to his manner made additions and alterations, which do not appear in the Latin, an independent significance must by all means be assigned to it.

Melancthon gave this treatise the title of "The Apology for the Confession;" and in the German text, "The Apology for the Confession, translated from the Latin into German, by Justus Jonas." The term "Apology" excited offence among the opponents, on account of which they desired at the convention of Schweinfurt, 1532, that the term "Assertion" be substituted for it, or that the term Apology be explained by a definition-

made to accompany it. Brück declined this request, in the name of the Evangelical party, while he replied, "that the term could not be omitted; that Apology was the correlative of Confession; that the princes, however, and his friends did not wish that other articles be taught different from those treated of here."

2. *Its Nature—Formation of the text—its Design.*—The character of the Apology depends naturally upon that of the Augsburg Confession, of which it should be viewed as a defence. With this Confession it corresponds article by article, in consequence of which Brück, with great reason, called it "the correlative of the Confession;" but as it had to be at the same time directed also against the arguments of the Confutation, some articles which had not been opposed, were dispatched with a brief notice, in order to afford room for a more full explanation, a further confirmation, and defence of those which had been made the subject of controversy by their opponents. Only the latter articles in the *Editio Princeps* and in the Book of Concord have their titles superscribed, but neither the one nor the other is distinguished by having numbers to the articles. Thus, article I. concerning God, and article III. concerning Christ, are but briefly discussed, while article II. concerning original sin is treated more at large; the same may be said of article IV. concerning justification, to which a subdivision, concerning love and the fulfilment of the law, with a reply to the arguments of the adversaries is attached, and here too is controverted, what the opponents of the Reformation have alleged, in connection with their objections to article IV., concerning the meritoriousness of love and of good works. Melancthon has passed over articles V. and VI., concerning the ministry of the church, and the good fruits of faith, because he had already referred to the objections of his opponents, in the foregoing articles. Articles VI. and VII., concerning the church, and what the church is, he has brought together under a single view, and he has only cast a short glance at the eighth, which found a willing reception; so too, in reference to article IX. concerning baptism, article X. concerning the Lord's Supper, article XI. concerning confession, briefly discussing what relates to article XI., still further explaining and determining the evangelical doctrine concerning confession, as treated in the subdivisions of article XII. Article XII. concerning repentance, with the appendix concerning confession and satisfaction, is treated at the same time with article XI. In article XIII., concerning the number and use of the sacraments, the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession concerning the sacraments, is established, and at the same time the argument is prosecuted against the seven sacraments of the Roman church. Article XIV., concerning ecclesiastical orders, is treated briefly, as well as article XVI., concerning political orders; article XVII., concerning the return of Christ to judgment, and article XIX., concerning the cause of sin, and also article XVIII., concerning freewill, are reviewed with brevity, in reference to the Pelagian errors of the opponents, and the errors thence resulting; but article XX. concerning good works, is discussed the less explicitly, because these objections had come under consideration already in article IV. On the contrary, Melancthon has treated article XV., concerning human traditions in the church, the more copiously, because the enemies of the Confession sought the more earnestly to defend the necessity of human traditions. Nor has he ex-

examined article XXI., concerning the invocation of saints, with less circumspection. With equal diligence he has defended the controverted articles,—article XXII. of the abuses in reference to both elements, article XXIII. abuses concerning the marriage of priests, article XXIV. abuses of the mass, article XXVII. abuses of monastic vows, article XXVIII. abuses of the power of the church,—while article XXV., abuses of confession, article XXVI., abuses of the discrimination of food, are passed over, because they had already been treated in the articles concerning confession and satisfaction, and concerning human traditions.

Since no manuscripts of the Apology exist, either in Latin or in German, we can only refer to the editions of Melancthon, from which has been derived what was said above concerning the Augsburg Confession. While the first edition was going through the press, Melancthon made entire alterations in the text, and, on this account, the sheets from A. to O. had to be reprinted. Vitus Dietrich preserved these six sheets, and they still exist in the public library at Nuremberg, and they were brought before the public by the rector Hummel, in his "New Library of rare Books," 1777. The second Latin edition of 1531 in octavo, appears not less altered, the text of which, as well as that of the *Confessio Variata* of 1540, is given, and for this reason, it is distinguished with the name too of *Variata*. We have already remarked that the German *Editio Princeps* was no translation, but merely a reproduction of the Latin; and this text, in a later edition, especially that of 1533, was greatly changed, as may be inferred from the title: "Amended with diligence." This first Latin and German edition was received into the Book of Concord.

3. *Its Authority and Importance.*—As the first draft of the Apology was not accepted by the Emperor, and as it was not published by the Evangelical party, it has consequently lost its original symbolic authority; and this authority the more copious work of Melancthon received in full. But this did not first occur, as Baumgarten contends, by its reception into the Book of Concord, but it was brought forward, already in 1532 at the convention of Schweinfurt, by the Evangelical party, as an acknowledgment of their faith; and in 1537 at Smalcald, it was subscribed together with the Confession, nor was it less included in the *Corporæ Doctrinæ*, before the publication of the Book of Concord. Concerning its Importance, the attacks of the adversaries furnish abundant evidence; for they must have deeply felt with how much force these clear, lucid, and elegant arguments, the logical acuteness, the quiet serenity, as well as the warm benevolence with which this treatise was composed, would bear upon the trembling infirmity of their own doctrines. Even Cochlaus himself had to complain, "that the Apology was gratifying even to most of the members of the Roman church, it was therefore necessary to prepare a brief confutation." Indeed so great and so universal was the impression made by this Apology, that he could find no one who would print his confutation. That there may be found some errors in matters of secondary importance, detracts nothing from its value. On the most essential point, namely, on doctrine, it is as pure as the Confession itself, as a justification of which it was written.

IV. THE ARTICLES OF SMALCALD.

1. *The Appellation and Origin.*—These articles derive their name from the Convention held at Smalcald, in February, 1537, this being the sixth convention of the seven occasioned by the league of Smalcald, where these articles were laid before the theologians collected there on the summons of their rulers, and there they were subscribed by these theologians. Pope Paul III., in the year 1536, had proclaimed the general and long desired council, to convene on the 23d of May, 1537, at Mantua, and invited the Evangelical party to attend, through his legate, Peter Paul Vergerius. The Evangelical party, however, entertained no great hopes as to the issue of such a council; indeed it was their opinion, as Luther declared, that there was no need of a council on their part. Yet they wished to keep themselves in readiness, if one should be held, to present their Confession as they had presented it before the Emperor and the assembly at Augsburg. With this view the elector of Saxony gave instructions to Luther, on the eleventh of December, 1536, to prepare articles of faith, which could be made the grounds of deliberation at that council. Luther immediately drew up these articles, privately at Wittenburg, in accordance with the charge of the elector; and in the year 1536, at his request, laid them before Agricola and Spalatin at Amsdorf, for their examination. By these men his manuscript was approved, and on the third of January, 1537, it was sent to the elector by Spalatin.

There is an Appendix attached to the Articles of Smalcald, which was composed also at the request of the elector, and indeed at the Convention itself. But although this injunction related to all the theologians present, and it is reasonable to suppose that all took part in editing the work, yet we know that Melancthon took up the pen, and that he exclusively is to be regarded as the author. For he writes to Justus Jonas: "I have been desired to write something against the power of the Pope of Rome. I have written it with a little more asperity than I am accustomed to use."

Both of these writings, at the request of the princes, were subscribed by the theologians who were present at Smalcald. Yet we need not suppose that the subscription was completed by them all at the same time in public convention; but it seems much more probable, so far as it relates to the Articles of Smalcald, that they were subscribed by some already at Wittenburg, by others on the way, to whom Spalatin presented a copy for subscription, and that many subscribed after the conclusion of the Convention. The signature of Melancthon is quite characteristic, and it has been used as a great objection to him. Kœlner has undertaken the justification of Melancthon, and, as it appears to us at least, has rendered it evident, that his overture, which has been made the subject of so much reproach, arose from his unceasing efforts to secure a more desirable position for the church in relation to the state. We must leave it with our readers, to examine for themselves, this important explanation of Kœlner. We give here one from numerous other overtures made by Melancthon, which we find in a letter of his to Camerarius: "I do earnestly wish that I were able, not indeed to establish the dominion, but to restore the administration of the Roman priests. For I see what kind of a church we are about to have, a clergy most irregularly organized. I perceive that there will be a more intolerable

ble tyranny hereafter, than has ever yet appeared." How exactly did Melancthon foresee the future condition of the church!

The signatures were attached to the Appendix after its completion at Smalcald, from the 23d to the 26th of February. For, on the 23d the request of Brenz was made to Bugenhagen, and on the 26th Melancthon makes known to the elector that all the theologians who were present had subscribed.

2. *Their Nature—Formation of the text—their Design.*—The Articles of Smalcald consist of a preface which Luther first prefixed to them, when he caused the articles to be printed in 1538, and of three parts, the first of which contains the articles respecting the Majesty of God, founded upon the ecumenical Symbols; the second contains the article concerning the office and work of Jesus Christ, and three articles more, concerning abuses of the Papists, which have special reference to the merit of Christ; the third part contains the fifteen articles concerning remaining points of Christian doctrine, of which Luther makes this remark: "The following points or articles we might discuss with learned and reasonable Papists, or among ourselves." And then follows the discussion concerning the power and primacy of the Pope, and concerning the power and authority of the bishops. In this way the Evangelical princes wished to justify their objections to some transactions of the Pope; for they had already determined not to acknowledge the authority of this council. And thus, these articles ought to be considered, not so much a confession of faith, as a collection of all that the Evangelical party taught as true, and all that they rejected as erroneous. An acknowledgment of the former they urged upon the council, and in reference to the latter they expected a declaration reforming the doctrines of the Roman church. But the power to establish what ought to be taught in the church, and what ought not, they were determined never to yield to the council.

The German text of the Articles of Smalcald, as they came from the pen of Luther, affords an evidence of his keen, independent mind, which was not to be bribed or bartered in what he had learned from the Word of God, and what he knew to be true; here he always expresses his own convictions with that vigor and acuteness, which were peculiar to him. Nor is the peculiarity of Melancthon less observable in his portion of the work: the logical analysis, the compact and learned arguments, the noble and dignified expressions, merit our unreserved acknowledgment, and secure the lasting influence of this treatise in the church.

Both manuscripts, which have been used in framing the text of the Articles of Smalcald, have fortunately been preserved down to our time:—the original copy of Luther, which was kept in the library of Heidelberg, and published in 1817 by Marheineck, and the copy of Spalatin which was exhibited at the Convention, and there subscribed. This is extant in the archives of Weimar, and in the year 1553, it was published by the theologians who were there, to which some later additions of Luther's were attached, under certain definite signs, and the places of omitted passages are likewise distinguished by marks. This copy was taken into the German Book of Concord of 1580. Luther himself in 1538 had caused the Articles of Smalcald to be published in quarto by Hans Luft, at Wittenburg, after which, in the same year, two other editions appeared in quarto, and then

again in 1543, and 1545, octavo editions followed, which were superintended by Luther himself, as remarked above, containing many alterations, either by additions or omissions, which do not, however, change the sense.

Luther's work was published in 1541, in a Latin translation by Peter Gennerauns, a Dane of the village of Gennera near Apenrade, who studied theology for eight years in Wittenburg, supported by the king of Denmark, who was an inmate at Luther's house, and, at a late period, became pastor and provost of Apenrade, but finally a Roman Catholic and a professor at Ingolstadt, where he died in 1584. But, in consequence of the apostasy of the author, this translation was not received into the Book of Concord. A different translation,—alas, by far a worse one,—the author of which is supposed to have been Selnecker, though it is more probable that he was only the editor of an edition of it, published at Wittenburg in 1579, has been received. At least Feuerlein has remarked that the text of Selnecker of 1580 and the edition of 1579, have the same striking errors of the press, as *ultimum ferculum* instead of *ultimum judicium*. Besides, Selnecker published a particular German and Latin edition of the Articles of Smalcald in the year 1582, and a second time in 1609, in which last edition the Latin text of the original Appendix is given.

For as Luther wrote these articles in German, so Melancthon wrote his Appendix in Latin. Yet not the original of Melancthon, but the German translation made by Vitus Dietrich, was presented to the estates at the convention as an official text, approved, and subscribed by the theologians. Now, although Dietrich published this work already in 1541, with the remark: "Written by Philip Melancthon, and translated into German by Vitus Dietrich,"—yet it was still forgotten that Melancthon was the author of it, and in the other publications of 1540, 1542, 1549, 1560, &c., it was distinguished as being without an author. Hence it happened that the theologians of Weimar, when they in 1553, as above mentioned, published the Articles of Smalcald, with this translation from the manuscripts found in the archives of Weimar, under the superscription employed in our Book of Concord, without any reference to a translation, with the remark, however, that it answered as the German original text; and Selnecker, in his Latin Concordia of 1580, employed a different Latin translation arranged according to the German copy, although Chytraus had printed in 1571 this Appendix as the composition of Melancthon, yet under the false date of 1540. Hence the original text again became public; and finally it was received into the *Corpora Doctrinae* of the corrected Latin Concordia of 1581. Since, however, a title peculiarly incorrect was here retained, we must be very careful not to be led into error by the misapplication of a word. There is another German translation never received, however, in the church, which Geyerberg made according to the Strasburg copy of 1540. For all these literary explanations our thanks are due to the industry of Bertram, whose history of the Symbolic Appendix to the Articles of Smalcald, Riederer has published at Altdorf in 1770, enlarged by additions.

3. *Their Authority and Importance.*—The Articles of Smalcald together with the Appendix of Melancthon, constitute an important part of the symbolic defence of the Lutheran church. They were composed at the request of the Evangelical princes and estates, presented before a public assembly of these nobles, approved and adopted, and in connection with the Augsburg

Confession and the Apology, were subscribed by the theologians. Thus it was proper to form them into one system with the first Symbols; but they have, in consequence of their nature explained above, an independent significance; because in these the Lutherans have, for the first time, explained with fullness and precision, their relation to the Pope and to Popery. We may say that in and through these, the Reformation has been established, and a separation of the Evangelical from the Roman churches definitely settled. With great justice then do they receive a place in the *Corpora Doctrinæ*, and in the Book of Concord.

V. VI. THE TWO CATECHISMS OF LUTHER.

1. *Their Appellation and Origin.*—The first church had catechumens indeed, but not catechisms, in our sense of the term. Those were called catechumens, who had manifested their desire to become members of the Christian church, were known to be fitting, and now stood in immediate preparation for the reception of Baptism. These catechumens were very far different from those of our time. They were persons of riper years, whose instruction had to be conducted, on this account, in a form quite different from that of our day, as we perceive from the *Catechesis* of Cyril of Jerusalem, and from other works. Such were the catechumens, mentioned in the New Testament, as Cornelius the centurion, the chamberlain from Ethiopia, Aquila and Priscilla, Apollos, the learned Jew of Alexandria, and others; such were the earliest of the church Fathers,—Justin, Athenagoras, Tatianus, Irenæus, Tertullian, Cyprian, Arnobius, Ambrose while bishop, Augustine, and others; and if we refer to the oldest catechetical pupil, Constantine the Great, who a short time before his death, caused himself to be recorded in the number of those under preparation for Baptism, and showed himself in this peculiar relation, as humble as he was ardent and fond of learning.

As to the instruction of these catechumens, which was performed, not in churches, but in particular buildings called *κατηχομενα*, catechists were more especially necessary for the improvement of these catechetical schools, and suitable books had to be prepared, as that by Gregory of Nyssia,—the *ο λογος κατηχητικος ο μιγας*, and that by Augustine,—*de catechizandis rudibus*,—a guide by which Augustine shows to the deacon Deogratias, how he had to manage catechumens who were men of business, learned individuals, grammarians, and other persons already grown up and well educated. These and other catechetical writings of the first century, necessarily were compelled to have reference always to the polemical objections of the Jews and pagans against the Christian system; but their contents assumed a different aspect, from the time the church attained a secure position, the access of adults became less frequent, and the baptism of children grew into general practice. The form of instruction gradually approached more and more our form of instruction previous to confirmation; but alas! with the cessation of opposition and through the burden of the task in gen-

eral, the zeal of instructors was lost, instruction relapsed, and an outward, ceremonial service took the place of information and of a living faith.

Great praise, however, is due to Charles the Great, who perceived the importance of religious instruction, and earnestly labored to promote its extension. He and Lewis gave prescriptions for the catechetical instruction of the people, in the common language of the Romans, as well as in the theological language of the church. In the eighth and ninth centuries, the first German catechisms appeared, namely, those by Kero of Galle and Godfrey of Weisenburg, and then again in the eleventh century by Notker Labeco. Ulric, bishop of Augsburg, made it the especial duty of the clergy to attend to the catechetical instruction of the people; and Otto of Bamberg assigned forty days to the pagan applicants as a period of preparation for Baptism. On the whole, however, there appeared much less solicitude in regard to catechetical instruction in the dominant church, up to the time of the Reformation. Only the treatise of Gerson, *de parvulis trahendis ad Christum*, and the treatise of the bishop of Chester, Reginald Peacock, can be named as elementary works on the Christian religion. But so much the more active were the sects which had seceded from the church,—the Albigenses, Waldenses, and the followers of Wickliff and of Huss,—for they were well assured that their own existence, under the oppressions of the dominant church, chiefly depended upon a radical instruction of the young.

Luther was also aware of this. The Reformation would prosper then only, when its interest was identical with that of the people, and this could only take place when the people from their youth, under suitable instruction, were initiated into the doctrines of the church, by a knowledge of the truth. Already in 1518 he published some works adapted with this view to the instruction of the people; but these were treatises which we may very properly term his first catechisms,—“Short forms of the Ten Commandments, of the Creed, and of the Lord’s Prayer;” which were printed in that year five times, once in the following year, and still more frequently without any mention of the year and place. Other men followed his example; and in 1525, Jonas and Agricola of Eisleben, by the instruction of the elector, undertook the preparation of a catechism.

But all the catechisms which appeared in the early days of the Reformation, could not retain the general esteem of the people; they all had to yield to the catechism of Luther. Very early he had conceived the design of writing a catechism; for he says in the preface to his work, entitled, German Mass and Order of divine service: “In the name of God, a plain, simple, unadorned catechism is necessary, first of all in the German service. But a catechism is a book of instruction, in which we may teach those heathens who wish to become Christians, what doctrines and duties they must believe, perform, allow, and understand. Hence those young people, who are to receive instruction, and who must learn the Creed before they are baptized, are called catechumens. And let no one think himself so wise as to despise this amusement of children. When Christ wished to gain men, he himself had to become a man; so if we expect to gain children, we must become children with them.” But Luther readily perceived how absolutely necessary it was that he should undertake this work, when he assisted in the church visitation held in Saxony in 1527 and 1529. Of this he speaks himself in the beginning of the preface to his *Smaller Catechism*: “The

deplorable moral wretchedness which I recently witnessed, when I visited your parishes, has impelled me to publish this catechism, drawn up in a very simple and brief form. Eternal God! what distress did I behold!—The people, especially those living in villages, and even curates for the most part, possessing so little knowledge of the Christian doctrine.” Thus on both hands Luther observed deficiencies,—on the part of the people, the want of Christian knowledge, on the part of ministers, an unsuitness for the proper performance of their official duties. Both of these deficiencies affected him to the heart; to both parties assistance must be afforded, and thus the two catechisms took their origin, which afford, to an extent as yet unsurpassed, not only all that is necessary for a Christian to know, but to the minister also excellent instructions for a profitable use of these doctrinal books.

Though such be the origin of both catechisms, it must not be supposed, however, that Luther composed his *Large Catechism*, which he had commenced already at the end of 1528, from the first as a manual for the teacher; but according to his *Shorter Preface*, he designed this catechism “as a book of instruction for children and illiterate persons,” and he shows at the conclusion, the threefold division of the catechism, which was the usual practice among the ancients,—the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer,—where he says, that he would close with these three divisions; and these he arranges under the superscriptions, “the First Part,” “Second Part,” “Third Part;” and he then gives the article concerning Baptism and the Lord's Supper as an appendix. In the same manner he proceeds throughout in the explanation of the principal divisions: at the beginning of the part concerning Baptism, he says: “We have now completed the three principal divisions of the common Christian doctrine; in addition to these, we have still to speak of our two sacraments,” &c.; and in the conclusion he enters still farther into the consideration of the design of the work for the old and the young. With this the declaration of Luther, in his letter of the 15th of January, 1529, to Martin Görlitz, exactly corresponds: “I am now engaged in preparing a catechism for the uninstructed members of the church;” where, there is no need of supposing, as seems to have been done up to the present time, that he spoke in reference to the *Smaller Catechism*. Judging from the plan of the *Larger Catechism*, and from his own declaration above referred to, Luther from the first had not the design of writing two catechisms. But his work expanded under his hand, and at the completion of it, he knew that it would not be suitable, in this form, for the instruction of the common people, of children, and the unlearned; and hence he determined to prepare for these persons a small catechism. In April, 1529, the *Larger Catechism* was completed in the German language; in May and July a translation was executed by Lonicer and Obsopæus; towards the end of summer the *Smaller Catechism* appeared, a Latin translation of which was in circulation so early as in September. That the *Smaller Catechism* had not yet been thought of at the completion of the larger one, is proved beyond a doubt by the remarks of Obsopæus in the preface to his translation of the *Larger Catechism*, July 1: “But to this we have added the two catechisms of John Brentius, of the church of Halle, for they may serve as an abstract or epitome of this one which is more diffuse.”

Whether, in the composition of his catechisms, Luther had recourse to writings of the kind already existing, more especially those of the Bohemian Brethren, who had advanced further in this branch of ecclesiastical literature, than the Romish church had at that time, is a question very difficult to decide. Augustine denies this, asserting that this catechism appeared much later; but Kœlner with propriety reminds us that the Bohemian Brethren, already in 1523, had caused a catechism to be printed in German and Bohemian, and had likewise sent a Latin copy to Luther; and these are facts which he declares in a particular treatise. It is moreover worthy of observation that their catechism contains, besides the three ancient divisions of the doctrines of the church, the doctrine also concerning the sacraments, and the table of family duties. And although Luther has adopted a similar arrangement for his Smaller Catechism, yet he has entirely remodelled the whole text, so far as it was not taken from the Bible; and with great justice, indeed, in addition to other epithets of distinction, with which his cotemporaries and posterity have honored him, he seems richly entitled to that of "Father of Catechisms."

It still remains for us to refer to the appellations, under which Luther caused his doctrinal works to appear. The smaller one he calls, "The Enchiridion, or Small Catechism for the common curate and minister." The larger one he calls, "The German Catechism." The name *catechism* for such writings as were calculated to subserve the instruction of the young, was already in general currency. That term, however, was not applied to any works of Christian antiquity. To such writings was then applied the term *κατηχησις*, from *κατηχεω*, in the sense of "to sound into the ear of any one," that is, "to instruct by word of mouth," and then again, "to inform concerning something," "to teach about something," Acts 21, 24, especially in reference to religious truths; in which sense this word soon afterwards came into general use in the church, Luke 1, 4; Rom. 2, 18; 1 Cor. 14, 19; Gal. 6, 6; and especially Acts 18, 25. Kœlner contends that the word *catechism* was first introduced by the Bohemian Brethren, who had named their catechetical writings *Catechesis* or *Catechismus*. In 1525, as above remarked, the elector of Saxony had ordered the composition of a *catechism*; and thus it appears that the word was at that time in general currency in our sense. The first work, however, which appeared in Germany, under the name of Catechism, was the catechism of Rurer and Althammer. An evidence of the great value which Luther and the church after him always attributed to these doctrinal treatises, is derived from the fact that the Catechism was popularly called "the Layman's Bible."

2. *Their Nature—Formation of the text—their Design.*—The catechisms of the ancient church, as Luther found them, consisted of three principal divisions. These were,—1. The Decalogue, so that instruction might be given, according to the arrangement of the Ten Commandments, concerning good works, and the cardinal virtues, and then, on the other hand, concerning the seven mortal sins. 2. The Creed, most frequently the Apostolic Symbol only, frequently also, similar to the Weisenburg catechism, the Athanasian creed, together with the hymn of saint Ambrose. 3. The Lord's Prayer, with an explanation, which was likewise taken out of the above mentioned catechism, and partially retained by Luther.

These were the three divisions, which have descended from the Fathers down to the churches of the present day. The catechism of the Bohemian Brethren had, besides these, the doctrines concerning the sacraments, and a table of family duties.

Conformably with the uniform aim of his labors, Luther has observed this arrangement of the ancient church. With this view, his Larger Catechism originally contained,—1. The Short Preface; 2. The text of the Ten Commandments, of the Apostolic Symbol, and of the Lord's Prayer; to which was added,—3. The words of the institution of Baptism and of the Lord's Supper; after the text, every time it is repeated, an explanation follows. The "Admonition to Confession" was not contained in the quarto *Editio Princeps* of 1529, yet, in the same year, it appeared in both octavo editions. The Larger Preface, together with the appendix concerning Confession, followed in the quarto edition of the next year, and thus to the present time, in all the following editions, the text remains principally the same. It is true, Luther made alterations here and there, in the words and expressions of his original text, but which, as we have intimated in a foregoing passage, were of no great consequence, especially as all the editions, from 1529 to 1538, remained entirely the same, while, on the contrary, the edition of 1538 exhibited considerable alterations.

The text of the *Editio Princeps* was received into the Book of Concord, because it was inserted in the German and Latin editions of the works of Luther. Hence, in the German Book of Concord, the "Admonition to Confession," together with a large division of the explanation of the Lord's Prayer, has been omitted.

Latin translations of this catechism appeared very early, and first of all by Lonicer: "The Catechism of Luther, translated into Latin by John Lonicer, Marburg, 1529." Lonicer was professor of the Latin and Greek languages at Marburg, and he dedicates his translation to Laticus Paulus Rosellus of Padua, who had desired him to prepare a translation of the work of Luther. Soon after, a translation by Obsopœus appeared: "The Catechism of Dr. Martin Luther, the theologian, most worthy to be read, translated into Latin by Vincentius Obsopœus, with the addition of two catechisms by John Brentius, translated by the same hand, Hague, 1529." Obsopœus was summoned by prince George to Anspach, in order to instruct the young in general literature, and he dedicated this translation to Albrecht, margrave of Brandenburg. This translation was published again and again in 1536; and in the editions of Peter Brubach, it appears, so far as we are able to judge from a comparison of the editions accessible to us,—that, for instance, published by Brubach in 1544 at Frankfort,—to be in a very complete and greatly improved form. It has been received into the Latin Book of Concord, though greatly altered by Schnecker, and not much to its advantage.

We cannot describe the original plan of the Smaller Catechism, since the *Editio Princeps* of that catechism is no longer extant. Riederer describes a copy, of 1529, which was found in the library of the university of Altdorf. This has the title, "Enchiridion: the Small Catechism for the common curate and preacher, enlarged and improved, by Martin Luther, Wittenburg." And at the end: "Printed at Wittenburg by Nickol Schirlenz, 1529." After the title, follows the ordinary preface, and after

this the five chief heads, each of which has a particular title covering one whole page, with the additional object every time expressed, "As it is most plainly to be taught by a father to his family." The text agrees with ours, only the Commandments are given in a shorter form. For instance, the fourth commandment reads thus: "Thou shalt honor thy father and mother." In the third chief head, concerning the Lord's Prayer, the Introduction is not inserted, and of the Conclusion we find only the word *Amen*, with the usual definition. After the five divisions, succeed the morning and evening prayers, with the grace at meat, and likewise the table of family duties. After these follow the form of the marriage ceremony, and that of Baptism, and in conclusion, a brief form of Confession. In this copy there was added the German Litany, with the notes of some melodies, several prayers and religious collections.

In the later editions, a form of Confession was inserted by Luther, before the principal division of the Lord's Supper; but we cannot say at what time, as, of the old editions of the *Enchiridion*, we could procure only that published at Wittenburg in 1539, a very beautiful but scarce edition, and this does not contain it. The fifth division, as we have it in the Book of Concord, is not characterized in this way by Luther, and still less by the superscription in our present catechisms,—“The words of the office of the keys,” with the two following questions: “What are the words of the office of the keys?” and “What does this imply?” This section, from the year 1561 on, was accidentally inserted between the division concerning Baptism and that concerning the Lord's Supper, especially in opposition to the Calvinists, who sought to expel the Confession and Absolution out of the church; and notwithstanding this location of it, it was called the sixth division. It is worthy of remark, that Matthesius, in his sermon on the life of Luther, speaks of the sixth division of the Instructions for children, and places Absolution between Baptism and the Lord's Supper, a proof that this arrangement was in vogue at that time, thirty-six years after the appearance of the Catechism.

From whom this division in its present form took its rise, has not yet been determined. It was ascribed at an early period to the first general superintendent of Pomerania, John Knipstroy, because he hid this “sixth division of the Catechism, concerning confession and the keys of the kingdom of heaven,” in the year 1554, before the synod of Greifswald, for their approbation. But Mohrke, in his treatise concerning the sixth division of the Catechism, has shown that the text of Knipstroy reads entirely different from ours. As little is it to be supposed that Breus, or Luther himself, as it is believed, is the author of it; but its origin is to be sought in the well known sermons at Nuremberg and Brandenburg on the catechism. The fifth sermon is entitled, “A sermon on the office of the keys,” and, after the citation of the passages from John 20, 22, 23, it asks the question: “How are these words to be understood?” Then follows the answer: “I believe,”—exactly as in our catechism.—“that what the called servant of Christ does, is the same as if Christ our blessed Lord himself had executed it.” And Franke arrives at the same conclusion, who, so far as we know, was the first to investigate and determine the question.

Later editions of the Catechism, have still another special appendix: “Some Christian questions with their answers, for those who wish to approach the Sacrament, drawn up in simple and expressive terms, by Dr.

Martin Luther." This, however, has not been received into the Book of Concord. The form of the marriage ceremony and that of Baptism was omitted in the general collection for the Book of Concord, and this was the cause of great offence to the theologians of Helmstadt and of Brunswick. Chemnitz was also dissatisfied. The omission, however, may be justified; for,—1. Neither of these is a writing of doctrine or of confession, but merely a book of ceremonies, and a liturgy. 2. The churches of different countries should enjoy freedom in forms of ceremony. And,—3. From what appears to be the character of the churches of Oberland, and those in the Palatinate, which have not employed forms of exorcism in connection with the ceremony of Baptism; and consequently they might take offence at this form of Baptism, while in other lands different forms of marriage ceremony have been practised. In this view, the three civil electors agreed, that it was entirely immaterial whether these two books were added to the Book of Concord, or omitted. It is only necessary to remark here that Luther, already in 1523, had translated into German this little work on Baptism, from the common Latin Formula, and in 1524 or 1526, had revised it, but at a later period, composed the additional book on the marriage ceremony.

The Smaller Catechism, in the year 1529, was translated into Latin at two different times; once by some anonymous translator, and then again by Sauerman, with the knowledge and approbation of Luther. The first translation, which Riederer describes, is the more especially important because it most probably was finished immediately after the first impression of the Catechism, and presents that work in the original form, which is now lost to us. It was given as the last part of the Prayer-book of Luther, and contains the usual preface, "Epistle to the curates and preachers;" after which a very simple and brief explanation of the Catechism follows. In the first two divisions, however, it is not drawn up in questions and answers, but in such a manner, that the explanations can be derived immediately from the expressions of the text. Of the Confession and the form of Absolution, nothing appears; the introduction of the fifth division reads somewhat differently, and the morning and evening prayers, and the prayers at table, with the table of family duties, appear. This translation, as a comparison of it with the description of Riederer proves, has been received in the Wittenburg Latin edition of the works of Luther, with a very few alterations in the fourth division. And consequently we might have good reason to maintain, that the Catechism is contained in its original form in the Latin works of Luther. The translation of Sauerman has the title: "A small Catechism for small boys in school. Little boy, do not despise this little book. It contains the chief precepts of the great God." This translation, with alterations however, has been received into the Book of Concord, and not,—as has been supposed up to the present time,—a translation no longer existing, made by Lonicer or by Justus Jonas. Other translations into Latin appeared as soon as this catechism began to be used in schools of learning.

Besides, the Smaller Catechism of Luther has been translated into the Greek, Hebrew, Arabic, and Syriac languages, and afterwards into nearly all living languages. Already in the first years of its publication, it appeared in the different dialects of the German language. The editions which it underwent, are innumerable; no other book, except the holy Scrip-

tures, enjoyed so great a circulation as this bible of the laity; so that Mathesius, thirty-seven years after its appearance, could write: "Praise be to God! more than a hundred thousand copies have been printed up to our time, and it has been introduced in every language in abundance, in every foreign land, and in all the Latin and German schools."

After the remarks in section first, little more need be said in reference to the Design of both these catechisms of Luther. The excellent prefaces to them both, plainly point out this design. The Smaller Catechism may serve as a manual and book of instruction for the young, for domestics, and for those of ordinary attainments; but the larger one will serve for the maturer Christian, and the minister himself. Though Luther had not this object in view in composing his Larger Catechism, yet his labor extended under his hand, as he afterwards perceived and declared himself: "The Smaller Catechism is the substance of this, condensed into a briefer form, showing what a Christian ought to know and believe in order to his own salvation; but the larger one contains the explanations, the further proofs, and applications of these principles."

3. *Their Authority and Importance.*—Great and universal are the authority and importance of these two catechisms for the prosperity of the Lutheran church, not indeed merely from the unopposed reception they have received among the Symbolic books of the church, but from the internal superiority of their contents over all other writings of a similar character. Their enemies have been forced to acknowledge this directly and indirectly. Exceedingly unpleasant were they to the Catholics, Philip of Spain and Ferdinand I., who published edicts against them; yes, with no common artifice did the Jesuits in Grätz collect, under the title: "The Smaller Catechism for the common curate and minister, enlarged and improved, from Dr. Martin Luther's works published at Wittenburg, 1587,"—certain references to the doctrines of the Romish church, which were found in the earlier writings of Luther, in order to bring the genuine catechism into bad repute. With no less artifice did the Cryptocalvinists act, who sought to betray the people by a falsification of the Lutheran catechism, and to injure it by their insidious intrigues. It should be understood, that the Lutheran theologians did not fail to oppose these wicked attempts of their adversaries, as they had done, in reference to other falsifications.

But such attacks could only but serve to elevate the regard of the Lutheran church for the valuable labors of her principal teacher; for the attempts of her adversaries proved in the most indubitable manner the incalculable value of these books, or rather much more; for they relate mostly to the Smaller Catechism, a book drawn up in such an elementary form, that it claims to be nothing else but instructions for children; designs nothing else but the aid of the common man. For this reason they have both, by the Formula of Concord, with great propriety been denominated the bible of the laity; and their symbolic authority, thus established, has continued and will continue, so long as the Lutheran church exists. On the contrary, it is very natural that, at a time when the unlimited authority of the holy Scriptures themselves has been questioned and resisted, the like oppositions must attend our catechisms. Indeed strong efforts were made by the Neologists to expel the catechisms of Luther out of the churches and schools, and secretly to introduce under his name, as

the Jesuits and Cryptocalvinists had done, books of doctrine entirely opposed to the principles of Luther. Innumerable is the multitude of those false catechisms, which came to light in the course of fifty years. But whilst they have been rising and imperceptibly stealing away into forgetfulness, the catechisms of Luther have triumphantly maintained the field, and, in the hands of true ministers, have enabled them to accomplish, even in our days, the regeneration of the church. Let us, therefore, disregard every conclusion like that of Ammon's,—“that the most obstinate believer must admit our catechisms long since to have lost their symbolic authority,”—and let us rather direct our minds to conclusions of far greater validity, as they have originated from the sanctuaries of the church.

In regard to evidences for the great excellence of the catechisms of Luther, especially the smaller one, there is no scarcity indeed: a greater number could easily be found than we can possibly introduce here. Justus Jonas, himself the author of a catechism, makes this declaration respecting it: “The Catechism is only a small book, which a person can purchase for a sixpence, but six thousand worlds are not commensurate with its value; I believe assuredly that the Holy Ghost communicated it to the venerable Luther.” Dr. Bugenhagen always carried it about with him, and censured the civil authorities, when he observed that they did not value it sufficiently high. Prince George of Anhalt testifies, that in this small bible of the laity, the substance of the doctrines of all the Prophets and Apostles, is collected in the shortest possible compass. Matthesius says, that if Dr. Luther, in all his life, had conceived or performed nothing good, except the introduction of both catechisms into families, into schools, and the pulpit again, the whole world could not sufficiently express their thanks to him. Dr. Frd. Mayer gives it the following applause: “Embracing as many ideas as words: as many useful lessons as heads.—Brief in its little pages, but incomparable in the magnitude of theological principles.” Dr. Seigmond Baumgarten calls it, “the true jewel of our church, and a powerful masterpiece of composition.” To the same effect Leopold Ranke declares, that “the catechism which Dr. Luther published in the year 1529, and concerning which he said that ‘he studied it himself, though he was an old doctor,’ is as excellently adapted for children as it is thoughtful; as comprehensive as it is profound, simple, and exalted. Happy the man who feeds his soul upon its precepts, who steadfastly adheres to it; he enjoys an imperishable comfort in every moment, through this kernel of truth, which, although covered by a light shell, is sufficient for the wisest of the wise.” The same applause has frequently been expressed too by men, who do not coincide with the doctrines of Luther. When a copy of the Smaller Catechism without the author's name was brought to notice in Venice, a certain theologian exclaimed: “Blessed be the hands which wrote this holy book!” How should we not accord with this pious prayer of Matthesius: “May Christ the Lord preserve this holy catechism with the Wittenburgian explanations, in our pulpits, in our schools, in the dwellings of pious fathers, and in the hearts of their children, and graciously secure it against every innovation.”

VII. THE FORMULA OF CONCORD.

1. *Its Appellation and Origin.*—As the Formula of Concord is the latest Symbol in the Lutheran church, so it has been the most violently opposed,—a circumstance which naturally resulted from its originating amidst the agitations and controversies of the church; and indeed if we can form a correct judgment of these controversies, we can at the same time have a proper conception of the Formula of Concord.

Thus the members of the Lutheran church had many reasons, to form as close a union among themselves as possible after the death of Luther. And yet on the day of the meeting of Concord, in 1546, after his death, every thing like harmony seemed to vanish from them. Indeed heretofore there were sectarians and individual teachers of error, as it could not be otherwise amidst that activity of spirit and that more unrestrained freedom of speech which arose with the Reformation. Yet the powerful spirit of the illustrious Luther held them down, and kept them under some restraint, either to perform their duties to the Christian community, or to separate themselves entirely from it. But the more the flame was smothered during his lifetime, the more fiercely it broke forth after his death.

The unfortunate war of Smalcald so earnestly opposed by Luther, with all its painful consequences, and among these especially the *Interim* and the controversy about the sacraments, as well as the intrigues of the Cryptocalvinists in Saxony, gave the chief impulse to those agitations which afterwards prevailed in the Lutheran church. Nor did they rest here; but as in controversies jealousies arose from a bitterness of spirit, so the distrust of the theologians created controversies about matters of less importance, which, excited to the highest degree of violence by presumption and obstinacy, increased the disquietude of the church. Now if it may be rendered evident, as the custom has uniformly been since the time of Planck, that the Lutheran theologians, in this instance, did not always observe a due degree of moderation,—indeed it was too much disregarded on both sides,—yet it should not once be doubted, that they had good reasons to receive with suspicion every unusual form of expression in theological matters, and in consequence to apprehend injurious results in reference to the church; for they had to deal not only with public enemies, but with false friends (Matt. 10, 36); but especially as the contention did not proceed from the Lutheran church, according to her character, which is ever conservative and never aggressive, but from those who, by the most unwarrantable means, and by the most objectionable duplicity,—as by false representations of the writings of Luther,—through a contemptible abuse of the confidence of their princes, were endeavoring to undermine the Lutheran system. The Lutherans never had recourse to such means; they never sought to employ such artifices in their arguments against the Confession of others.

But the Lutheran church can boast not only of this, but also of an honorable effort, namely, to settle the contention in the proper manner, that is, by means proper to be employed by a church. From this effort, in the year 1536, resulted the "Formula of Concord" at Wittenburg; and in 1574 the "Formula of Concord between the Swiss and Saxon churches" appeared; the last of which became the foundation of our "Formula of Concord."

Already before this Formula came into existence, numerous efforts had been made for the restoration of concord: and therefore, in 1558 the Diet of the electorate of Frankfort, in 1561 that of the princes of Naumburg, and in 1568 the Colloquy at Altenburg, were held. Things, however, were not brought to an adjustment by these efforts: on the contrary they became infinitely worse. This was especially the case between the electoral Saxon theologians and the ducal Saxon theologians. In Saxony, especially at Wittenburg, the doctrine of the Cryptocalvinists prevailed, which the pupils and friends of Melancthon had spread over the whole country; in the jurisdiction of the duke, the doctrines of Luther were maintained, principally by the theologians at Jena. The political relation of these contending parties, as it had arisen during the war of Smalcald, naturally contributed to prolong these dissensions. Augustus, the prince of Saxony, however, felt the necessity of re-establishing the peace of the church. And when Julius, the duke of Brunswick, in concert with William, the landgrave of Hesse Cassel, sent Jacob Andrea, the provost of Tübingen, an accomplished and experienced man, to him, he received him graciously, and gave orders to the theologians at Wittenburg to hold a consultation with him in reference to the controverted points, and to labor with assiduity for whatever might contribute to promote the security of Christian unity.

Andrea had already in 1568, drawn up a draft, consisting of five articles, for the purpose of restoring harmony in the church; and when the consultation at Wittenburg proved unavailing, in consequence of the insincerity of the theologians who were there, he laid it before a second convention of the theologians of Wittenburg and Leipsic at Dresden in 1579, but here also he failed to secure the acknowledgment of these men. In the same year, twenty-one theologians under the jurisdiction of the elector of Saxony, of the duke of Brunswick, of the landgrave of Hesse Cassel, of John the margrave of Küstrin, of the prince of Anhalt, and of the cities of Lower Saxony, assembled at Zerbst, and united themselves under what was called the *Norma Serrestana*, that is, to the following effect,—that only the Three Symbols, the Augsburg Confession, and the Apology, together with the writings of Luther, but not the *Corpus Doctrinæ* of Melancthon, should prevail as a rule of doctrine. But here also the ingenious artifice of the Philippists completely deceived the honesty of Andrea, who was even suspected of having formed a secret conspiracy with them, and was compelled to defend himself openly against the charge. Precisely such was the case too, in reference to the learned Dr. N. Schnecker, through whom the duke of Brunswick charged the elector to watch the movements of the Wittenburgians, and he was sent by the elector, bearing the injunction to these, to furnish him with a plain and correct explanation, by which every injurious misunderstanding might be prevented or removed. Not only was he most egregiously deceived by those men, who proved false and unfaithful, and who showed themselves like real Pharisees on the seat of Moses, that is, of Luther; but there was also a second convention held at Dresden in October 1571, with an instrument called the *Consensus Dresdensis*, drawn up by the theologians of Wittenburg, and imposed on the remaining theologians, which soon turned out to be a real *Dissensus*, and was rendered nugatory by their dishonest conduct. Still the elector continued to exercise patience towards them, and employed the mildest modes of reasoning and reference,

when they let that execrable book of Exegesis appear, published at Leipsic in 1574; even after the executive committee had advised severer methods to be employed, and foreign kings, princes, and lords had advised the same. But in the investigations which were made, in consequence of this requisition; and especially by a letter of the secret Calvinists, sent to the elector, facts came to light at Wittemberg, and at his court, which placed the duplicity and designs of these men beyond all doubt, and compelled the elector to exert himself more zealously against them. In May 1574, he convoked a diet at Torgau, acting in conjunction with nineteen unsuspected professors and superintendents, and articles affirmative and negative were laid before them; drawn up by Daniel Greser, Dr. Casper Eberhard, Casper Heidenreich, and Dr. Martin Mirus, while the president of the Consistory, Dr. Paul Crel filled the chair, which articles, under the name of a Declaration of the Dresden Confession, which have also been denominated the Articles of Torgau, were received and subscribed. The result of the investigation was, that those who refused to subscribe these Articles, were rejected and banished from the country, or thrown into prison, some for their lifetimes.

In this manner Cryptocalvinism in Saxony was repressed, but by no means completely exterminated. Andrea perceiving this, sought by the friendly power of argument to re-establish the unity of the church. He caused six sermons to be printed concerning the dissensions in the church, and sent them to M. Chemnitz and B. Chytraus, in order to secure the acknowledgment and signature of the Saxon theologians. But as these sermons did not obtain general approbation and assent, Andrea framed them into eleven affirmative and negative articles, which he named the Explanations of the churches of Suabia and the dukedom of Wittemberg. This work was partially altered and improved by Chytraus and Chemnitz, and was entitled "The Suabian and Saxon Formula of Concord." It met with great approbation from Julius, duke of Brunswick, who secured its reception in Lower Saxony, and sent it to the elector Augustus, who received also about the same time the Formula of Maulbrun from George Ernst, the landgrave of Henneberg, who had caused this Formula to be drawn up by Luke Osiander and B. Bidembach, for the purpose of allaying the controversies of the church.

In the mean time the elector, on the 21st of November, 1575, had referred a treatise of his own, together with a memorial, also in his own hand writing, to his private councils, in which he solicited their co-operation in this work, and showed how it should be commenced and prosecuted. We have to ascribe much weight to these favorable exertions of the elector, against the charges of the opponents of the work of Concord, already mentioned in section third, because they prove that an opportunity for this salutary work was secured by the elector alone, and that he knew perfectly well in what manner things might be brought into the most favorable situation. The declarations of the elector are especially worthy of remark,—that good in every respect must not be expected from the immortal Philip Melancthon, and that the restoration of peace must not be looked for from a colloquy, a convention, or the like. On this account, Dr. P. Leyser with justice observed, that no one should intimate that the elector suffered himself to be deceived by the theologians, and that he in every respect acted as they had directed him. Dr. Schuecker likewise declares, that it would be a shame—

less fiction, should any one presume that the wise elector should have been induced by a few theologians, to take up the labor of restoring Christian concord.

The importance of both these testimonies induces us to give the following genuine transcript. The passage written by the elector reads thus: "Counsellors! beloved and faithful: experience shows, alas! what good the schism among our theologians in our country and in other lands, is calculated to produce; and although we should have hoped that the Lord would in some way devise means by which the theologians might unite among themselves, yet it is abundantly apparent from the colloquy at Altenburg, what kind of a union they arrived at. And although every civil government should conduct itself with caution and timidity, in attempting interferences with the perplexed minds of the theologians, yet I have foresight enough to perceive, as there is no Pope amongst us, that if government does not interpose, nothing better need be expected from this schism, but a greater amount of injury and disadvantage, which will entail a train of miseries upon our posterity. And though in reference to my own person, I have considered these matters again and again, so far as my understanding enabled me, yet no method has seemed to please me so well as that indicated to you; and although it was not in my ability to present it so fully as matters of such magnitude require, yet I hope that any expressions and my meaning in this *memorial* will be sufficiently understood by every one, and that every one will perceive that I *seek nothing farther than a unity of doctrine and of the theologians*; and may God grant us his gracious aid in effecting this! Amen. It is, therefore, my earnest desire to you, that you speedily come to my assistance with your deliberations, have an eye to the harmony of doctrine and of the theologians, and do not suffer yourselves to be misled, because your instructor may not be considered correct in every respect; and on this account, look more to the honor of God than to that of departed men; and I make no doubt, that, without any suggestions of mine, you will know how to act with due diligence and deliberation, continuing to communicate to me your views and determinations; this I expect of you, and remain yours most graciously. Augsburg, November 21, 1575. Augustus the elector, to John of Bernstein, Thomas of Sebottendorf, Dr. Laurence Lindeman, and Dr. B. Peifer."

The following *memorial* accompanied this communication: "Though I have revolved the subject in various aspects, it seems to me very difficult, indeed almost impossible, to effect and establish a union among us, who acknowledge the Augsburg Confession, beholding, as we do, that in the jurisdiction of nearly every lord, there is a distinct system of doctrines, which is called a *Corpus Doctrinae*, composed and established; in consequence of which, not only many people are led astray, but the minds of the theologians are embittered against each other, so that they become every day further and further alienated; and alas! it is to be feared, if no effectual means be employed against these attempts, that, through this malignity and alienation of mind among the theologians, we and our posterity,—a calamity which the gracious God only can avert,—will in a short time be led off entirely from the true doctrine, and through controversies like these, they must lose it. Let no one, who is better qualified to effect this, however suppose that I have anticipated him in offering the following suggestions.

"And because I can entertain no hopes, from past circumstances and experience, painful as it may be to make the acknowledgment, that the theologians can be induced to feel reconciled, to be composed, or to hear the voice of reason calmly from one another, in any colloquy or any other convention, far less to frame a system of union among themselves, yet I have been thinking, whether it might not be the best way, that we, who acknowledge the Augsburg Confession, unite and compose ourselves in a friendly spirit; that every lord name some theologians who are lovers of peace, to the number of three or four persons, as well as an equal number of political counsellors, and appoint a day for them to assemble. Then let every lord bring his *Corpus Doctrinæ* with him, and deliver it over to the assembled theologians and civil counsellors, that they cause the Augsburg Confession to be their model, and try, and deliberate, and determine, how they may, by the grace of God, according to that *Corpus Doctrinæ*, form a single *Corpus Doctrinæ* out of all that may be presented, to which we may all make acknowledgment; let that book or *Corpus Doctrinæ* be reprinted, and let every ecclesiastic in each dukedom be governed by it."

His private counsellors could only sanction the proposition of the elector, and they advised an early prosecution of this view, together with the theologians who accompanied them; and thus a communication was sent to other Evangelical princes and lords, as the elector John George of Brandenburg, the landgrave William of Hesse Cassel, George Frederick, margrave of Brandenburg and Anspach, and George Ernst, prince of Henneberg; and in February, 1576, a convention of twelve theologians was summoned at Lichtenburg, a castle of the elector, near Prettin on the Elbe, in order that their plans might there be proposed and discussed. There were three points which they proposed for their special reference and consideration. 1. That all reproaches, all charges should be laid aside and forgotten, and that every controversial writing should be regarded as extinct and exterminated. 2. That the *Corpus Doctrinæ* of Melancthon should no longer be forced upon the conscience as a rule and Confession of Faith; but that the Prophetical and Apostolic writings only should maintain their authority without limitation or restrictions of any kind, and after these the three general Symbols, the original and unaltered Augsburg Confession, together with its Apology, Luther's Smaller and Larger Catechisms, and the Articles of Smalcald, to which might be added Luther's Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians in reference to the doctrine of justification. But all the books of the Cryptocalvinists, as the new Catechism of Wittenburg, the Book of Questions, the *Stereoma*, like the *Consensus Dresdensis*, should be rejected. 3. Finally it was proposed that some disinterested theologians, as well as those foreigners named by the landgrave William, as Dr. Chytraus, Dr. Chemnitz, Dr. Jacob Andrea, and Dr. Marbach, undertake this work of reconciliation, perchance in the presence of the elector and other princes, compare the articles of the Augsburg Confession again with each other, erase or correct every discordant expression which had insinuated itself, though without any mention of names, and likewise to explain some things in a Christian manner, in order that the true, sincere servants of God, sleeping in the Lord, might not be wrongfully loaded with false accusations.

Upon this proposition, delivered to the elector, probably on the seven-

teenth of February, he now took a further step. He sent the Formula of Maulbrun and the Confession of Lower Saxony, to Dr. Jacob Andrea, for the purpose of receiving his advice in reference to this matter, and when he advised that both treatises, the first of which was too short, the second too long and inconvenient. (it must be remembered that the latter was compiled by Andrea himself, and revised by Chemnitz and Chytraus,) he made the foundation of a new confession, and in this way to unite the advantages of both the former works, rejecting the imperfections of both: on Sunday, Rogate, May 1576, the general assembly was opened at the castle of Hartenfels at Torgau. Twenty theologians were summoned to this colloquy, and eighteen actually appeared. Eleven of these,—Dr. Mörlin, Dr. Crell, Dr. Selnecker, Dr. Harder, Daniel Gröser, Dr. Mirus, M. Lysthen, M. Jageteufel, M. Cornicalius, M. Schutz, and M. Glasser, had been at Torgau in 1574, and all were then present at Lichtenburg; the other seven, mostly foreigners,—Dr. Andrea Musculus, Dr. Christopher Cornerus of Frankfort, Dr. Jacob Andrea of Tübingen, Dr. David Chytraus of Rostock, Dr. Martin Chemnitz of Brunswick, M. Casper Heyderich, superintendent at Torgau, and John Zanger, coadjutor of Brunswick for the first time appeared at the summons of the elector. John Jentsch, private secretary of the elector was also present. The Synod had the most fortunate result. Its members acted in every respect according to the opinion of Andrea; and by the seventh of June 1576, they were able to deliver the fruits of their labors to the elector, who, in the same benevolent spirit which he had previously manifested,—that he would willingly be subjected to the expense of a hundred thousand guilders or more, in order to restore the peace of the church,—even with as great joy, as heartfelt humility, wrote to Andrea: “Beloved lord and doctor,—with sincerity of heart, I give thanks to God for his kindness, because He has graciously heard my humble prayer, and with his Holy Spirit has kindly assisted you in the settlement of two great Articles, as your letter informs me,”—(in reference to Original sin and Freewill, Andrea had written, namely, after these two points were elucidated and the sentiments of the Synod were taken on them.)—“bringing your deliberations to a happy conclusion; and I will not cease my prayer, weak and contemptible as it may appear before the eternal God, to carry this work on still farther, until all the difficulties of this Christian assembly be brought to a conclusion, grateful to us all. And may the Holy Trinity cherish and promote this great object! Amen. And be you entreated ever to advance, as you now have been advancing, for the faithfulness of God will assuredly continue to stand by you. Augustus, the elector.”

This system of Doctrine drawn up at Torgau, the arrangement of which, in twelve articles, was afterwards made a foundation for the Formula of Concord, had the title: “The Resolutions at Torgau, showing in what manner and by what means, through the power of the Word of God, the rising dissensions between the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, may be settled and composed in Christian harmony. A. D. 1576,” and to this was prefixed the preface to the Formula of Maulbrun. So soon as the work was laid before the elector, he examined it not only himself, but sent it to his private counsellors, and afterwards to other Evangelical princes and estates, with the request that they would also examine it carefully, and

return it to him with their corrections and remarks. Dr. Martin Chemnitz, and especially Dr. Jacob Andrea, wrote to others, who undertook different journeys on account of this matter; for it was an object of earnest solicitude with the elector, to have this work examined with the utmost precision, and to have every sentence of it brought to as high a degree of perfection as possible.

After the opinions and criticisms of most of these men had been obtained, the elector delivered them to three theologians, who have already been named very frequently,—Chemnitz, Andrea, and Selnecker,—in order that they might review and improve this Book of Torgau from the criticisms now before them. This duty they accomplished for the first time in March, 1577, at the cloister of Bergen, near Magdeburg, and very probably in April of the same year, as some criticisms upon the work were still coming in, they reviewed it again in a second conference; but the final conclusion of this review was at last effected at a third and larger assembly in May of the same year, where Musculus, Cornerus, and Chytraus were engaged in addition to the three theologians mentioned above. For the purpose of obviating the inconvenience complained of in consequence of the size of the Book of Torgau, an abstract from it, called the *Epitome*, was made at the first convention; and at present in the title applied to the whole work, still consisting of two parts, which it retains in our Book of Concord, and which was originally “A general, clear, correct and final Repetition,” instead of the first word was substituted the word “complete,” because it was indicated that all members of the Lutheran church would not adopt this book. There was still another convention summoned by the electors of Saxony and of Brandenburg in 1578 at Tangermünde, with the view of profiting by the latest remarks and corrections; but the decision was, to be careful that no further alterations be made in the work. Other conventions were held with the Hessians at Langensalza, with the theologians of Anhalt at Herzberg, and with the theologians of the elector at Smalcald; but of these only the last proved of any consequence. Finally in January 1579, at the convention of Jüterbock, a preface was composed by the reviewers of the Book of Torgau; in February at Bergen, especially after some remarks by the elector of the Palatinate, some alterations were made, and in June it was entirely concluded at Jüterbock.

Such was the origin of this treatise, which at first was called the Book of Concord, and afterwards, so far as we can learn from Selnecker's Recitations, in the edition of Heidelberg of 1582 it was called the Formula of Concord. For Selnecker remarks,—that “Some one, in reference to the title of the book, intimates that ‘Formula of Concord’ may seem too ostentatious.” The latter appellation became the most generally current, as the former might easily have been confounded with “The Book of Concord,” that is, the full collection of the Symbolic books, the *Codex Symbolicus* of the Lutheran church. The appellation “Book of Bergen” was originally applied by the Lutheran theologians, but at a later period it was retained only by the opponents of the work of Concord, to whom “Formula of Concord” was very naturally a quite repulsive term.

2. *Its Nature—Formation of the text—its Design.*—The Formula of Concord is divided as to its contents into two parts, the “Epitome,” and the “Full Declaration.” Each of these two principal parts has twelve ar-

ticles, which are alike in both as to their character, and only differ from each other in form and expression; while the Epitome, in strict conformity with its name, presents the articles in short sentences, and in such a manner, that each in the first place represents the state of the controversy, in the second place enforces the affirmative arguments of the Christian church, and in the third place, the negative, or the antitheses, the false doctrines of the opponents, follow. The "Full Declaration" does not contain this threefold arrangement of articles, but presents the arguments more copiously and in immediate connection; while at the same time the choice precepts of the holy Scripture, the quotations from the Fathers of the church, from the other Symbols, from the writings of Luther, and from other writings, are added. Besides the twelve articles, each division has an introduction, concerning the compendious form, basis, standard, and rule of doctrine, by which all doctrines are to be decided, and the errors which have arisen, are to be determined and explained in a pious manner; and in the Full Declaration, besides the preceding, there is a brief preface.

In the arrangement of the articles, reference was had to the Augsburg Confession; for it was the design of the Formula of Concord to furnish an explanation of the first Symbol of the Lutheran church, and to point out successfully the deviations of certain theologians from that Confession. But as the chief design of the authors and promoters of the work of Concord, as well as the most effectual defence of the Augustan System of doctrine, was directed towards the settlement of controversies, and towards a mild and gentle correction of existing errors, so all personal insinuations were to be avoided, and distinct reference was to be made only to the doctrines, and not to the teachers of those doctrines. The *Condemnation* in the antitheses, of false doctrine, to which so many violent objections had been made, notwithstanding the full explanation given in the preface,—while to a similar condemnation in the Augsburg Confession and in other Symbols, no objections had been urged, intended no personal assault, much less a determination upon the eternal destiny of any one, but it should be regarded merely as a mode of expression current in the church. And because the suppression of the various dissensions in the Lutheran church, was the main object contemplated in the Formula of Concord, so those articles of the Augsburg Confession, which had been exclusively directed against the erroneous doctrines of the Romish church, were here no farther discussed, though the opinions in opposition to the articles concerning Original Sin, Justification, Good Works, the Lord's Supper, and some other points, were always mentioned.

Since, as already remarked, the Formula of Concord, in the statement of the controverted points, expressly attacks no individual, and, concerning matters of facts themselves, treats so far only as seemed absolutely necessary, circumstances seem to demand some brief explanations. The first article, concerning Original Sin, is directed against the (Manichæan) errors of Matthias Flacius and his followers, as well as against the Pelagian doctrine of the Romish church. The second article, concerning Free-will, is opposed to the doctrines of the Synergists and the violent Philippists. The third article, concerning the Justification by Faith before God, attacks the errors of Osiander and Stancarus, and at the same time it is directed against the friends of the *Interim*, who would not admit that man is justified by faith

alone. In the fourth article, concerning Good Works, the propositions of Major and Nicholans of Amsdorf, are rejected, which are opposed to each other, and culpably extravagant on both sides. In the fifth article, concerning the Law and the Gospel, the true doctrines on both these subjects are vindicated in opposition to the views of John Agricola and other Antinomians; and with this view the sixth article, concerning the third use of the Law, is added. The seventh article, concerning the Lord's Supper, is directed against the public and private Sacramentarians, and against the Calvinists, where the Papal doctrine of transubstantiation with the abuses resulting from it, are rejected. The eighth article, concerning the person of Christ, is directly opposed to the Cryptocalvinists; and to this is added the ninth article, concerning the descent of Christ into hell; which did not exist originally in the Suable and Saxon Formula. The tenth article, which describes the usages of the church, which usages are called *Adiaphora* or things indifferent, rejects the errors of the so-called *Adiaphorists*, who took their origin from the adoption and approbation of the *Interim*. The eleventh article, concerning the eternal foreknowledge and election of God, is opposed to the Calvinistic doctrine of predestination; and it will guard against all ambiguous expressions, by which, on the one hand, men are induced to feel a groundless security, and on the other, are thrown into despair,—a provision so much the more necessary, because the earlier Symbols had established no definite opinions on this point, and Luther himself as well as Melancthon, rigidly attached at first to the Augustinian theory, yet at a later period had forsaken it. The twelfth article, concerning other sects and factions, who never had acknowledged the Augsburg Confession, had no other object than the perfect establishment of the Reformation,—that the Lutheran church, in doctrine and practice never had and never would have any conformity with the propagators of commotion and error. A Catalogue of Testimonies was added, as an appendix, however without any symbolic force, and merely as a private document prepared by Andrea and Chemnitz, which exhibits the evidences from Scripture and from the Fathers of the church, concerning the union of the two natures in Christ, and the communion of properties resulting from that union, and which was intended to furnish evidence that the Lutheran church has introduced no new doctrine on this subject. As the elector of the Palatinate contended that this document by the appellation of Appendix was designated as a general division of the Book of Concord, and consequently as a symbolic writing, which was not its design, it was afterwards entirely omitted in many editions, or else no longer distinguished by the name of Appendix, as it had been in the oldest edition.

The signatures have no reference to the Appendix, and therefore they stand before it, and immediately after the conclusion of the Formula of Concord. The manuscript which we had the opportunity of seeing, has the subscriptions duplicate, that is, attached to the Epitome as well as to the Declaration.

Like the main basis of the Formula of Concord,—the Suable and Saxon Confession, the Formula of Maulbrun, and the Book of Torgau,—the whole work itself was originally composed in the German language. The transcripts of the Formula of Concord, sent to the Evangelical princes and estates, seem to have been completed and sent directly after the first Con-

vention at Closterbergen, March 1577,—a thing which we must conclude from the fact that those with which we have become acquainted, still retain in the title of the Declaration, *General, Clear Repetition*, instead of *Complete, Clear Repetition*. Since no important alterations were made at the later Conventions of Bergen and Tangermünde, these transcripts agree entirely with our printed copy, though it is to be observed that numerous typographical errors were made in the impression. The first Latin translation of the Formula of Concord was made by Luke Osiander, and Selnecker used this translation in his first Latin edition of 1580; but, in consequence of numerous errors, it seemed necessary to take up in his especial German and Latin edition of 1582, an altered translation. But as this also received numerous censures, especially from the theologians of Brunswick, at the convention assembled at Quedlinburg, 1583, it was revised and improved under the direction of Chemnitz, and then it was received in the first authentic edition of 1584. In this form it was retained, and constitutes the Latin text now received by the church. In 1705 Philip Müller republished the text of Selnecker of 1580; but he could not secure the public approbation to his enterprise. Another translation was to have been made by Jacob Heerbrand for Lewis, the duke of Wittenburg; but if this was completed, it has remained entirely unknown to the public. Pfaff indeed, Walch, and others have asserted that Heerbrand had taken a part in the translation of Osiander; but in opposition to this, it is merely necessary to refer with Kæhner to the evidence of the three delegates of the elector of Saxony to the convention at Quedlinburg, who say expressly, in their report to the electors of Saxony, of Pfalz, and of Brandenburg, that Dr. Luke Osiander was the author of the Latin version so far as it concerns the *Extract* and *Complete Repetition*, that he candidly and openly acknowledged it himself, and that he is ready to defend it against any one.

The Formula of Concord, together with the other Symbolical Writings, has been translated into the dialects of Holland and Sweden.

3. *Its Authority and Importance.*—The authority of the Formula of Concord as a Symbol, in the Lutheran church, is decided, and it may be maintained both from its internal and external influence. The internal influences arise from the peculiar nature of this confessional document, from the causes of its origin, and from its relation to the other Symbols. For to these it has continual reference, and it makes no further pretensions, than to be an exposition of the church in relation to the systems of doctrine in her earlier Symbols, as the Augustan for instance, and a confirmation of this Symbol under the emergencies which had endangered its existence at that time,—an exposition which had become indispensable from increasing errors in regard to the doctrine of Faith. We have made reference to this peculiarity in a preceding section; but it would be an egregious error, however, were we to infer from this circumstance, that the Formula of Concord has merely a negative tendency, while on the contrary it really maintains a very positive character. In relation to this character, the reproach has always been urged, that the Formula of Concord herein transgresses the limits of the earlier Symbols; that, especially in the articles concerning Freewill, concerning the Lord's Supper, and concerning the Person of Christ, it introduces into the church new doctrines, new and ambiguous modes of expression. Now, it is true that we meet with many expressions

in the Formula of Concord, of which the Augsburg Confession presents no instance, in the same manner as the latter differs widely, in form and expression from the ecumenical Symbols; but of new doctrine, in reference to which alone the objection is made, the Formula of Concord has introduced as little in opposition to the Augustan Creed, as that Creed has introduced in relation to the Confession of the primitive church; the only difference is, that the circumstances of the church required an expansion of her system of doctrines into their necessary consequences. But the Formula of Concord has not departed a single step from the radical and elementary doctrines of the church, or to express our meaning more explicitly, from the doctrines of the Word of God. All its definitions, many of which appear at first sight to want simplicity, approve themselves, on a closer and more impartial examination, to be in strict conformity with the Scriptures. And whoever laments that this Formula does sometimes advance to the utmost point, let him consider the great importance of driving an artful, a cunning enemy sporting with words, from his last lurking-place, and of not leaving him a single foot more room upon the platform of the Lutheran church. The Formula of Concord is certainly not intended for such people as know scarcely any thing at all about the doctrines of the church, or else desire these doctrines to remain always in the same conscious state of elasticity and suspense, for fear of being burdened with too much precision. But, the very thing which these men find objectionable, we must approve and explain as a quality altogether indispensable in a confessional writing for the church,—that precision, for instance, with which it unfolds every point of doctrine, under every aspect, so that no one can remain in doubt for a moment about its design, or the relation which it bears to him. It is composed altogether in the spirit of Luther,—a German of clear and keen discriminating powers, one who advances immediately to his point, and is utterly incapable of prevarication. The Epitome, even when viewed in reference to the purity of its doctrine, is decidedly a model form for confessional writings; while both the Epitome and the Declaration deserve to be highly esteemed and diligently studied, not only by every theologian, but by every member of the church, susceptible of knowledge. The most of those who have turned away full of apprehension at the very name of Formula of Concord, have surely never read it with attention, nor compared it with the holy Scriptures.

Nor is the symbolic authority of this work less indubitable on external considerations; for it is not as Planck loves to call it,—the performance of a triumvirate.—Andrea, Chemnitz, and Selnecker,—excessively generous and mild towards the confessions of others, but ungenerous in the highest degree towards its own; but it is the work of a wise and pious prince, acquainted with the sorrows of Joseph from his own experience of many long years, the work of the elector Augustus of Saxony, who was not led by the theologians, as the old and new opponents of the Formula of Concord contend, but who directed, under his own supervision, these men as well as his own counsellors, as his own letters show. It was not conceived and written in secrecy, nor imposed upon the church by irresponsible men, but it originated from the church herself, was examined by her legitimate organs, subjected to public investigation, before its final conclusion, and frequently revised and improved, by reference to the criticisms which it had

received. That, for its introduction, a general assembly of the church was not convoked, as was at first intended, has its reasons partly in external relations, partly in the belief of the electors of Saxony and Brandenburg, that the counsels in the smaller circles or provincial synods might be more advantageous; and it is not true that the so-called Fathers of Bergen prevented a general synod. In a word, no one was compelled to receive or to subscribe it. The often far-fetched and foolish objections of its enemies, were listened to and corrected, with moderation and patience; time was allowed to every one to consider: indeed each one was admonished, in the name of the elector, not to subscribe against his conscience. Now, even if Hutter will contend that many may have subscribed with reluctance, yet this is a conjecture drawn from the mere arrangement of the signatures, which is no proof that the signatures were obtained by force. Andrea confidently asserts, at the convention of Herzberg, 1578: "I am able to declare most truly that no man was compelled to give his signature, nor banished on account of refusal. If this is not true, the Son of God has not redeemed me with his blood, nor am I a partaker of his blood." In consequence of this declaration, the opponents were challenged to name only one who had been compelled to subscribe, but they were not able: on the contrary, it was acknowledged by those of Nuremberg, who rejected the Formula of Concord, that the signatures were obtained without compulsion. Many had subscribed the Formula of Concord, and at a later period recanted; especially is it known in reference to Dr. Urban Picorius, that he was accustomed to number the subscription of this document among his greatest sins. But neither he nor any other person attempted to assert, that he was compelled to subscribe. In all Saxony only three refused their signatures, and one, the superintendent of Kolditz, recanted, when he had obtained a situation at Nuremberg. If we consider how numerous the followers of Philippism and Cryptocalvinism were in Saxony, we may regard this fact as a proof always as much to be lamented, as it is conclusive, that a great number were entirely influenced by the apprehension of political difficulty. But is this an argument against the work of Concord, and not much rather an evidence of the flexibility of the Philippists as contrasted with the firmness of the Flacians, who preferred to go into exile, rather than subscribe the *Corpus Philippicum*? For is the declaration of Andrea against Chemnitz any proof, when he says: "We have been exercising tyranny upon our pastors, as an excellent man, a pious minister of the church once told me in confidence, that he was struck with astonishment when so tyrannical a proposition was made, and seemed to be hearing the promulgation of the Mosaic law from Mount Sinai: 'I do not believe that equal severity was ever exercised in any place.'" Was it not a work of great moment, and could it be accomplished without the highest degree of earnestness? Or if Andrea and his colleagues expressed themselves with much asperity towards the Cryptocalvinists, was it not their right and their duty, in view of the amount of evil which that sect had brought upon the Lutheran church? Here by Andrea's allusion to the exercise of *tyranny* or *force*, he must be regarded as alluding to the use of *strong expressions*, and is there no difference between these? In a word, all the accusations of Hospinianus, Balæus, and others against the mode of introducing the Formula of Concord, either amount to nothing of importance,

or immediately vanish from the light of Truth. They refer indeed to various histories, and appeal to the evidence of "*credible*" men, but they take very good care not to name them; so that Hutter and Selnecker oppose to their falsehoods only a simple denial. This question, moreover, is only of subordinate importance; but all depends upon the enquiry, whether the doctrine of the Formula of Concord be in conformity with the Scriptures, and whether it exhibits the analogy of faith or not; the whole is also a contention about principles, which never can be decided by urging additional circumstances.

That this instrument of Confession was not adopted in a full assembly of the church, is certainly no disadvantage to its symbolic authority. For an overwhelming majority did acknowledge it; three electors, twenty princes, twenty-four earls, four barons, thirty-eight imperial cities, and about eight thousand holding offices in churches and in schools, had subscribed so early as 1577 and 1578. In other provinces, in and out of Germany, it was adopted at a later period; and those who refused to receive it, did so for reasons which by no means impaired its authority and consequence, but only served to corroborate them. Its reception followed successively in the electorate of Saxony, of Pfalz, and of Brandenburg; in the dukedom of Prussia, Wittenburg, and Mecklenburg; in the margravate of Kulmbach, Baireuth, Anspach and Baden; in Oberpfalz, Neuburg, and Sulzbach, the principedom of Brunswick and Lunenburg, in Thuringia, Coburg, and Weimar; in Mümpelgard, in Magdeburg, Meissen, Verder, and Quedlinburg; in the earldoms of Henneburg, Ottingen, Castell, Mansfeld, Hanau, Hohenlohe, Barby, Gleichen, Oldenburg, Hoya, Eberstein, Limburg, Schönburg, Löwenstein, Reinstein, Stolberg, Schwarzburg, Leinungen, and others; in the towns of Lubeck, Hamburg, Lunenburg, Regensburg, Augsburg, Ulm, Biberach, Eziingen, Landau, Hagenau, Rothenburg, Goslar, Mühlhausen, Reutlingen, Nördlingen, Halle, Memmingen, Hildesheim, Hanover, Göttingen, Erfurt, Einbeck, Schweinfurt, Brunswick, Münster, Heilbrunn, Lindau, Donauwörth, Wimpfen, Gingen, Bopfingen, Aalen, Kaufbeuern, Kempten, Issny, Leutkirch, Hameln, and Nordheim. To those countries which adopted the Formula of Concord, have subsequently been added Lauenburg, of Saxony, since 1586; Sweden, at the Council of Upsal in 1593, and the Diet of Stockholm in 1647; Holstein, since 1647; Pomerania, since 1685; and somewhat earlier Krain, Kärnthen, Steiermark, and Ungarn, at the Convention of Eperies in 1593, and of Lentschau in 1597. Its introduction into Denmark was forbidden upon pain of death, by Frederick II; indeed the king is said to have thrown the copy sent to him by his sister, the electress Anna, into the fire; still it obtained, at a later date, a high authority in this country also, and was in reality used as a Symbol, though not publicly acknowledged.

A portion of the theologians of Silesia were prevented from subscribing it through the power of the secret Calvinists, especially those in the dukedom of Liegnitz, Brieg, and Wohlau, likewise those in Hesse Cassel, Zweibrück, Nassau, Bentheim, Tecklenburg, and Solms, besides the officers of the churches and schools in the dukedoms of Cleve and Berg; in the earldom of Mark and Ravensberg; these in the principedom of Halberstadt, in Osnabrück, Ortenburg, Austria, and at first in Bohemia, and some in Silesia and Lansitz, were prevented by their Roman Catholic liege-lords.

Some Lutheran princes and estates did not adopt the Formula of Con-

cord, partly because they were devoted to the doctrines of Calvin,—as, Hessa, (at first however, only Lower Hessa,—the clergy of Upper Hessa having declared in its favor; the landgrave William was from the first entirely in favor with the work of Concord, and so likewise his brother Lewis, and especially his brother George,) Anhalt, Zweibrück, Dantzic, partly from an excessive attachment to Melancthon and the *Variata*, from political reasons, or from the reflections of their neighbors, especially from an offence conceived in consequence of not being at first invited to participate in the work of Concord, as Nuremberg, Magdeburg, Strasburg, Frankfort, Speyer, Worms, Bremen, most of whom, however, asserted that they coincided in doctrine with the Formula of Concord. Of the signers of this Formula, Julius, duke of Brunswick, changed his resolution, when he saw himself censured because he had bestowed on his sons church honors and prebends under the Roman see; and he was particularly alienated from the Formula of Concord, when the controversies of the theologians of Helmstadt occurred with those of Saxony; while John Sigismund, elector of Brandenburg, adopted the Reformed Confession, and at the same time declared himself released from the Formula of Concord. But Casimir, as administrator, had introduced the Reformed doctrine already in 1583, after the death of his brother, the elector, Lewis.

From this exposition it is evident that the small number of Signatures, as well as the objections of adversaries, cannot impair, to any considerable extent, the symbolic authority of the Formula of Concord; and we can agree with Selmecker in his funeral sermon on the elector Augustus, where he says: “One thing is certain, that so long as we preserve, in our churches and schools, the Confession and explanation, contained in the Book of Concord, throughout this country and others, so long will the purity of the Word of God, or of doctrine, together with other blessings of God, continue among us without fanaticism; but so soon as the pure Confession be in the least transgressed or violated, God, who has at last given us this great blessing, will withdraw it from us, and permit all kinds of difficulties and fanaticism to rush in upon us.”

VIII. THE BOOK OF CONCORD.

The Book of Concord is the collection of all the symbolic Confessions, the Creeds, and the Doctrines of the Lutheran church. They are—1. The three ecumenical Symbols; 2. the unaltered Augsburg Confession; 3. the Apology; 4. the Articles of Smalcald; 5. the Smaller, 6. the Larger Catechism of Luther; and 7. the Formula of Concord. The publication of the Book of Concord was commenced at the command of the elector of Saxony, in 1578, under the direction of Dr. Jacob Andrea, with whom Peter Glaser, the archdeacon, and Casper Fuger the deacon of Kreuzkirk at Dresden, were associated as correctors. The issue of this work took place on the same day of the month, June 25th, in 1580, as the delivery of the Augsburg Confession had in 1530.

This is to be understood of the German text, and it is to be remarked particularly of this, that the copies of 1580, exhibit variations which prove that alterations were made, not only during the operation of printing them.

but that several editions were made in the same year. Feuerlein enumerates seven editions of 1580, and it may now be questioned which is the original edition, and whether these seven editions may not be reduced to a smaller number, by observing that alterations were introduced in consequence of corrections received during the passage of the first edition through the press, while it can still not be admitted, that a work so voluminous, could have been so often reprinted in less than two years. Kœlner, whom we and Fræke follow, with great propriety gives much weight to the evidence of Chemnitz, who knows of two editions only; namely, of the first, in which is found an Errata, and of another edition published at Dresden, in which these errata are corrected. If there had been other independent editions, Chemnitz certainly would have mentioned them. So Hutter likewise names only two editions, assigning the want of the Saxon signatures in the first, as the distinctive difference between these two. All the variations which appear in the seven editions enumerated by Feuerlein, can easily be explained as the alterations of a few pages of the two editions,—as nos. 27 and 28 belong to the first edition, nos. 29 up to 33 belong to the second. But the signs by which the *Editio Princeps* can be distinguished are the following: 1. It has an Errata appended. 2. It mentions a period of 25 years, which in other editions is said to be 30 years. 3. The twentieth article of the Augsburg Confession was introduced according to the German edition of 1531, on page 269. 4. It contains the articles concerning the ceremonies of Marriage and of Baptism; or where these are wanting, it has the paginal numbers, 169, 170, 171, 172, 173, all printed on the last page of the Smaller Catechism, in order to preserve a similarity in the designation of pages with the copies already published. 5. The Latin text is printed in Italic letters. 6. The Catalogue of Testimonies is called Appendix. 7. At the end of the book, after the signatures, is a particular page upon which above are the first and second verses of the ninth Psalm, and then a wood-cut, upon which stand, in a circle, the names of the printers Matthes Stöckel and Gimel Bergen, with the date 1579; under this again they are repeated in the following manner: “Printed at Dresden in the Court-residence of the elector of Saxony, by Matthes Stöckel and Gimel Bergen, 1579.”

Selnecker published the first Latin edition in the year 1580. As he adopted the title from the German Book of Concord, it contains an incorrect statement.—“Communi consilio et mandato eorundem Electorum, Principum, ac Ordinum Imperii.” Because the text of the Augsburg Confession was published after the octavo edition of 1531, and also because the translations of the other Symbolic books are more or less disfigured with errors, as we have explained in the present Introduction, this first Latin publication was not acknowledged; and Selnecker is obliged to confess in his second edition, the only authentic one of 1584, that “the Book of Concord had previously been published in Latin, but in a private and hasty manner.” A Latin edition was not published in 1581, as was formerly believed, from confounding it with Selnecker’s edition of the Formula of Concord in that year.

JOHN T. MÜLLER,
EVANG. LUTH. MINISTER.

IMMELDORF, BAVARIA,
December, 1847.

MANDATE OF CHRISTIAN II.

CHRISTIAN II., BY THE GRACE OF GOD, DUKE OF SAXONY, CHIEF MARSHAL AND ELECTOR OF THE HOLY EMPIRE OF ROME, LANDGRAVE OF THURINGIA, MARQUIS OF MISNIA, AND BURGOMASTER OF MAGDEBURG, &c.

To the church dignitaries collectively and individually, to the Counts, Barons, and the whole order of Knighthood subject to our authority, and to that of the Bishops at Misnia, Naumburg, and Merseburg; to the Military Commanders and their subordinate officers; but most especially to the superintendents, the Pastors and Ministers of churches, our salutation and favor.

Reverend, illustrious, brave, and venerable men,—faithful and devoted to us,—we have now for several years been receiving information, that the churches and schools of our provinces generally have been censured among distant states, as if some change of Confession took place among them almost every seven years. This intelligence was the more grievous to us, the more closely we examined the subject, and we are now fully prepared to prove, that our most devout and worthy ancestors, of pious and hallowed memory, had never changed their Confession, from the very origin of the Reformation, after God, in this twilight of a declining world, had graciously kindled the light of Gospel truth, by the agency of his chosen instrument, Dr. Martin Luther, and had most kindly diffused it pure and uncorrupted from his indubitable Word; but all the electors in order have persisted in the Confession, with that invincible firmness which, in the year 1530, was manifested to the emperor Charles V., and to the whole Roman empire,—and they have spread it abroad with pious devotion; some have even sustained many injuries, and incurred heavy expenses, through their zeal in maintaining it; so that the glory which they have acquired by their constancy in the true religion can, or ought to be, by no means impaired.

At the same time we have discovered this also,—that there are certain false and deceitful men, who boast to their supreme government in terms very specious indeed, and even declare with oaths wickedly conceived, that they are devoted to the pure and unaltered Augsburg Confession, in opposition to all corruptions and visionary opinions of the Calvinistic sects, as well as of others, who nevertheless have since been detected cherishing false doctrines and erroneous opinions about the sacraments, and endeavoring by means of their adherents to introduce privately their treacherous schemes and machinations, to disseminate and spread them abroad with all their energies, without the knowledge of their own government regularly and divinely instituted.

This class of men have indeed excited riots sometimes and dissensions in the schools and churches of these territories, which always, however, through the grace of God, have been suppressed and quieted by the Christian magistrate, as soon as he was informed of the wicked movements of these night prowlers.

Since then God himself deeply abhors men so inconstant and wavering, men who are neither cold nor warm, and threatens them that he will cast them out of his mouth, we immediately applied ourselves, on the commencement of our administration, to the duty of providing that all our counsellors, courtiers, chieftains, subordinates, and those exercising other functions, observe an oath administered under the sanction of religion, and pledge their faith, that they will, by the assistance of God, resolutely persevere to the end of their lives with us in the first unaltered Augsburg Confession, as it was transcribed and declared in the year 1580, in the Christian Book of Concord, and carefully fortified against corruptions of every kind. We have undertaken this duty, having maturely deliberated and meditated upon it in every aspect, with the obvious design, that the wicked attempts of these treacherous men, who circulate by their secret insinuations among distant states, so foul a reproach against our provinces, may by this salutary measure, with the assistance of God, be effectually resisted.

We know too (praise and glory be to God) that the illustrious noblemen and rulers Sir John George, and Sir Augustus, dukes of Saxony, our highly esteemed brethren, agree in all things with us in this cause of religion, as in others also.

In order therefore that this pious and truly Christian work may be preserved, even as under a shelter repaired, and may be perpetuated to coming posterity, and that no one may have reason to pretend, that occasion and opportunity for reading this Symbolic Writing were denied him, we have taken care that the Formula of Concord, agreeing in every respect with the authentic copy, be printed and published in each language, in Latin and also in German, but in a smaller form, in order that it may be purchased at a lower price, as well as more conveniently circulated.

And henceforth in our own name, and first in the guardian name of our most beloved brethren, we devoutly enjoin it upon you individually and collectively, as above mentioned, that as you agreed with us in this matter in the last provincial assembly, so let each one still in his own capacity persist resolutely in that determination, for the pledge of his honor once given to us.

And especially we enjoin upon our counsellors delegated to the duties of schools and churches, the doctors and professors of academies, the justices of ecclesiastical courts, upon all superintendents and their subordinates, upon pastors and deacons, likewise upon rectors and fellows of the high schools, and other principals of schools generally, together with our stipendiaries and alumni, that they hold this book very dear to them, that they handle it by night and by day, that they meditate with due sincerity, that they collect their proofs from it, and that they do not promote any one to office, who has not approved this book, both by his subscription and by his fidelity pledged upon oath, and that they strive with all their energies, that nothing contrary throughout this famous electorate of ours, in schools and in churches, be either taught publicly or introduced privately, as the mercy of Almighty God, our favor, and the health and security of his own life are dear to each. May ye act up to this agreement, which is consistent with your duty, and commensurate with your serious and constant affection towards us; and on our part we shall be most kindly disposed towards you.

Given at Dresden, August 1, 1692.

PREFACE TO THE BOOK OF CONCORD.

To all who shall read these writings, we, who have subscribed our names, attached to the Confession of Augsburg,—the Electors, Princes, and Estates of the sacred Roman empire in Germany, according to the dignity and rank of each,—proclaim and present our good wishes, the friendship and salutation connected with our office.

It is a remarkable favor of God, the greatest and best of beings, that, in these later days, in this latter age of the world, he has been willing to cause, according to his unutterable kindness, love, and mercy, the light of the Gospel and of his Word, to arise pure and serene over Germany, our beloved country, and shine forth upon the human race, after those dark hours of Papal superstition: For this reason especially, a brief and compendious Confession has been collected from the Word of God, and from the Sacred Writings of the Prophets and Apostles, which was also presented, in the German and Latin languages, at the Diet of Augsburg, to the illustrious emperor, Charles V., in the year 1530, by our very pious predecessors, and submitted to the princes of the empire, generally indeed to all men professing the Christian doctrine; and having been disseminated, in this manner, throughout the world, it has become universally known, and begins to be in the mouth and conversation of all.

Besides, many churches and academies have embraced and defended this Confession, as a certain Symbol of these times, in the chief articles of faith, especially in those arguments against the Romanists and the various corruptions of divine doctrine; and with constant uniformity, and without any controversy and doubt, they have appealed to it. The doctrine also embraced in that Confession, which they know to be supported by the solid evidences of Scripture, and approved by ancient and acknowledged Symbols, they have uniformly considered the special and perpetual source of harmony in the church justly appreciating it,—formerly the defence of that church against numerous heresies and errors,—a doctrine which is now again restored.

But surely it cannot be unknown to any one, that immediately after Dr. Martin Luther,—a most excellent man filled with the deepest piety,—was removed from human cares, Germany, our beloved country, experienced the most dangerous and violent agitations in her public concerns. Amid these difficulties, this deplorable confusion of our country, formerly so flourishing and regulated so well, the enemy of men labored ingeniously to scatter the seeds of false doctrine and division in the churches and schools, excited dissensions, excited offences, and by his artifices corrupted the purity of divine doctrine, broke the chain of pious harmony and Christian charity, and, to a greater extent, obstructed and impeded the progress of the holy Gospel. It is also known to all in what way those enemies of divine truth, afterwards seized an opportunity to betray our churches and schools, to find pretexts for their errors, to withdraw the timid and erring

consciences of men from the purity of Gospel doctrine, and to employ those who were more subservient in bearing and enduring the yoke of Papal servitude, and in embracing other corruptions, also at war with the Word of God.

Doubtless nothing could have happened either more agreeable to us, or which we could consider worthy to be sought from the Supreme Father of the universe, with more fervency of mind, and with prayers more ardent, than that our churches and schools might have persevered in the pure doctrine of God's Word, in the same pious and desirable unanimity of mind; and, as it happened while Luther still survived, that these might have been established in piety, and consigned to posterity with distinction, according to the Rule of God's Word. But we have observed that, just as in the times of the Apostles, corruptions were introduced into those churches in which they themselves had planted the Gospel of Christ, so, on account of our sins and the depravity of these times, a similar evil has been permitted by an angry God to befall our churches also.

Wherefore, mindful of that duty which we feel to be enjoined upon us by heaven, we conceive ourselves bound diligently to attend this matter, to guard against false doctrines in our provinces and dominions, which have there been disseminated, and which secretly insinuate themselves more and more, as it were, into the practice and familiarity of men; and to cause our subjects in the empire to persevere in the right path of piety, and in the known truth of divine doctrine, which has hitherto been constantly preserved and defended, and not to suffer them to be withdrawn from it. For this purpose, our most worthy predecessors in part, and we ourselves,—as that resolution prevailed with unanimous consent in the year 1558, an opportunity presenting at the Diet, which at that time was held by the electors at Frankfort on the Maine,—mutually determined that a special and general convention be held, in which it might be debated, among ourselves, in a profound and yet in a friendly manner, concerning those matters which have been, in the way of abuse, maliciously objected by our adversaries against our churches and academies.

After these deliberations, our predecessors of pious and excellent memory, and we ourselves in part, assembled at Nannburg in Thuringia in 1561. And at that time we took in hand the Confession of Augsburg, of which we have spoken several times, which had been presented to the emperor, Charles V., in a full diet of the empire, in the year 1530; and we then again, with one consent, all subscribed that pious Confession, which is founded upon the solid evidences of immutable truth expressed in the Word of God,—in order that we might serve posterity in that way, and as far as lay in our power, become their authorities and advisers for avoiding those false doctrines which war with the Word of God. And we did this with the design, that a perpetual testimony might be afforded to his Majesty, the Emperor, our most gracious lord, as well as to all men every where, that we never had conceived an intention to defend or to disseminate any new or foreign doctrine, but that we desired constantly to protect and retain, by the assistance of God, that truth which we professed at Augsburg, in the year 1530. We also conceived no slight hope, that, in this way, not only those who were averse to the pure Gospel doctrine, would desist from their false charges and accusations, but that other good and be-

nevolent men also would be conciliated by this renewed and reiterated Confession of ours, would examine and investigate, with greater zeal and solicitude, the truth of divine doctrine, which alone is our guide to salvation, and, consulting the welfare of their souls and their own eternal happiness, abide in that Confession, rejecting for the future all controversies and dissensions.

But we have been informed, not without great distress of mind, that this declaration of ours and rescript of the Confession, has had but very little weight among our adversaries, and that we and our churches were not freed from the imputations of prejudice, which they had been scattering with the greatest malignity among the people. We have been informed that in this design, those things which we have done for the best purpose and with the best intention, have been represented by the enemies of true religion, as if we were so uncertain concerning our religion, and were transforming it so often into different and still different formulas, that it was not known either to us or to our theologians, what was the Confession formerly delivered to the Emperor at Augsburg. These representations of our adversaries have withheld and alienated many virtuous men from our churches, our schools, our doctrine, our faith, and Confession. To these adversities it was also added, that under color of the Augsburg Confession, a doctrine conflicting with the institution of the holy Supper of the body and blood of Christ, and other corruptions also, were introduced extensively, both into our churches and schools.

When some pious men, fond of peace and harmony, as well as learned theologians, had observed these things, they believed they could not more effectually oppose the abuses and dissensions in religion, which were gradually increasing more and more, than by declaring and explaining the controverted Articles, with force and accuracy, from the Word of God, by rejecting and condemning false doctrines, and, on the contrary, by representing with learning and eloquence, the Truth as delivered down from heaven; as they were persuaded, that, in this way, they would be able to impose silence upon their adversaries, and to point out to the more simple and virtuous a certain way and method, how they might conduct themselves in these dissensions, now and in future, and, assisted by divine grace, avoid the corruptions of doctrine.

In the first place, therefore, these theologians communicated among themselves certain writings sufficiently diffuse, and extracted from the Word of God, in which they showed with learning and ingenuity, how those controversies connected with the disorder of the churches, might be entirely quieted and suppressed, apart from any disturbance of divine truth; for thus it would happen, that the opportunities and pretences sought by our adversaries for the purpose of abuse, would be cut off and removed. At last they investigated and proclaimed, with scrupulous accuracy, the controverted Articles which they had received, and in a special treatise, they proposed the way and method by which these rising dissensions might be judiciously and piously repressed.

Having been informed of this pious resolution of the theologians, we do not only approve it, but in proportion to the extent of our influence, and the office entrusted to us by heaven, we conceive ourselves bound to promote it.

Accordingly in a council of some other electors and princes, agreeing with us in religious opinion, we, by the grace of God, Duke of Saxony, Elector,

&c., summoned to Torgau, in the year 1576, some of the most distinguished and least suspected theologians, highly cultivated and distinguished by their eminent erudition. When these men had assembled, they conscientiously conferred among themselves concerning the controverted Articles, and the Edict of Pacification of which we have spoken a little while ago. And first indeed, having offered up pious prayers to the great and beneficent God, and to his glory and praise,—the Spirit of the Lord assisting us with his grace,—all those matters which seemed to relate to this deliberation, and which seemed to be required, were comprised, with remarkable diligence and care, in a certain treatise. That book was afterwards transmitted to some eminent men, professing the Confession of Augsburg,—the electors, the princes, and estates,—and it was requested that, having assembled the most eminent and learned theologians, they should read it with anxious care and pious attention, should diligently examine it, and embody in writing their opinion and censures of it; and finally, that they should freely represent to us the judgment of all and of each of them, and the reasons for it.

When, therefore, we had received these critical remarks, we found many pious and useful suggestions among them, how that declaration of the pure Christian doctrine, might be fortified and defended by evidences from the holy Scriptures against all corruptions and distortions, lest perhaps in process of time, impious doctrines might lie concealed, under cover of this declaration; but by no means should the declaration of pure Truth be transmitted to posterity with a stain upon it. From these views, then, which had come to us extremely well digested, the *Christian Book of Concord*, to which we have referred, has been composed, and that form was adopted in which it is now presented.

Whereupon certain persons of our order, (for we all, as well as some others, for certain reasons which interposed at the time, were not able to do it,) took care to have this book distinctly recited article by article, to the theologians, collectively and individually, of our regions and jurisdictions, and to the ministers of churches and schools, and to have *them* aroused to a diligent and accurate consideration of those points of doctrine which are contained in it.

When, therefore, they observed that the Declaration of the controverted Articles agreed, first indeed with the Word of God, and then with the Confession of Augsburg, with the greatest alacrity and an earnest attestation of their gratitude to God, they approved this *Book of Concord*, as expressing the pious and genuine sentiment of the Augsburg Confession; they received it voluntarily, and having fully and deeply meditated and reflected upon the subject, they subscribed to it, and openly testified their assent, with heart, and tongue, and hand. Wherefore, that sacred Pacification is called, and shall ever be, the *unanimous and concordant Confession*, not only of some few of our theologians, but of *all* and *each* of the ministers of the church and the teachers in our provinces and dominions.

But because our conventions and those of our venerable predecessors, first at Frankfort on the Maine, and afterwards at Nannburg, undertaken with a pure intention, and comprised in our writings, not only failed to attain that object and reconciliation which were desired, but an exense has been sought, even out of them, by some persons, for errors and false doctrines,—while, however, it never entered our minds, either to introduce, by

this treatise of ours, any new and false kind of doctrine, to recommend and establish it by disguises, or even in the least to depart from that Confession exhibited at Augsburg, in the year 1530; but rather, that as many of us as were concerned in the transactions of Naumburg, even then reserved it entirely to ourselves, and promised besides, that if, in process of time, any thing should be wanting in our Confession, or as often as necessity seemed to demand it, we would still further declare all our principles with fullness and integrity;—so, for this very reason, we have labored in this *Book of Concord*, to declare our constancy and unintermitted devotion, and to repeat our Christian Faith and Confession with great and pious unanimity. Lest, therefore, some may suffer themselves to be disturbed by the misrepresentations of our adversaries, fabricated by their own ingenuity, in which they pretend, that we do not even know which is the true and genuine Confession of Augsburg, and in order, too, that those who are now among the living, and posterity also, may be taught, with power and success, which *that* pious Confession is, which we, as well as the churches and schools of our dominions, have at all times professed and embraced, in the pure and immutable truth of God's Word, we testify distinctly, that we desire to embrace the first Augsburg Confession only, which was exhibited to the emperor, Charles V., in the celebrated Diet of Augsburg, in the year 1530, that *only*, we say, and no other, a copy of which, deposited in the Archives of our venerable predecessors, who exhibited it themselves to Charles V. at the Diet, we wish to be compared by men worthy of all confidence, (lest any diligence might be wanting in ourselves, to secure the most accurate determinations,) with the one exhibited to the Emperor himself, and preserved in the Archives of the sacred empire of Rome; and we are sure that our copies, the Latin and the German, correspond with each other in every sentence. For this reason also, we have desired to include the Confession then exhibited, with our Declaration or *Book of Concord* which is here presented, that all men may know that we are resolved to tolerate no other doctrine in our dominions, our churches, and schools, than that which was approved at Augsburg, in the year 1530, by the above mentioned electors, princes, and estates of the empire, in a solemn Confession. And this Confession, through the kind assistance of God, we shall maintain, with an elevated, undaunted spirit, and a pure conscience, to our last breath, until we pass from this life to another world, ready to appear before the tribunal of Jesus Christ our Lord. We hope, therefore, that our adversaries will hereafter spare us and the ministers of our churches, and not employ their accustomed and bitter charges, that we can come to no certainty among ourselves about our faith, and for this reason are forging out new Confessions almost every year, yes indeed every month.

Concerning what relates to another edition of the Augsburg Confession, of which mention has been made in the Acts at Naumburg, we remark, (a matter which is known to all,) that certain persons, under the disguise of expressions in the latter edition, wish to cover and conceal corruptions in the administration of the Lord's Supper, together with other errors, endeavoring to obtrude them upon the unwary multitude; nor are they influenced by the precise terms of the Augsburg Confession which was first exhibited, in which those errors are expressly rejected, and from which a sense can be derived far different from that which they wish to see. It seemed proper

to us, therefore, to testify publicly by these letters, and to inform all men, that we did not then wish, nor do we now wish, by any means, to defend or to excuse false and impious doctrines and opinions, which might lie concealed under some disguises of expression, or to approve them as if agreeing with the doctrine of the Gospel. We indeed never viewed the latter edition, under the impression that it differed in any respect from the former which was exhibited. Nor do we believe that other useful writings of Dr. Philip Melancthon, of Brentius, of Urban Regius, Pomeranus, and the like, ought to be rejected and condemned, as far as they agree with that rule which is expressed in the *Book of Concord*.

And although some theologians, and Luther himself among them, when they contended about the Lord's Supper, were unwillingly drawn by their adversaries into a disputation about the personal union of the two natures in Christ, yet our theologians, in the *Book of Concord*, and in what is the rule in it of the more wholesome doctrine, earnestly testify, that it is our constant and immutable opinion, as well as the declaration of this book, that pious men ought to be directed to no other principles, in the administration of the Lord's Supper, than those in the words of the institution, contained in the Testament of our Lord Jesus Christ; for, since he is almighty and infallible, he will assuredly observe what he has instituted and promised in his Word. And as this defence was not assailed by the adversaries, they did not persist in this kind of argument by other methods of proof; but in the true simplicity of faith, they strongly adhered to the very explicit words of Christ.—a method which is the most secure, and the best adapted for the instruction of unlettered men; for such men do not understand those points in these subjects, which are contested with so much profundity. But since our assertion and the plain sense of the words of Christ in the Testament, were assailed by the adversaries, and rejected as if too impious, and too much opposed to the principles of true faith, contrary indeed to the articles of the Apostolic Symbol, (especially as to the incarnation of the Son of God, his ascension into heaven, and his sitting at the right hand of the omnipotent power and majesty of God,) and even further, since charged with being false, it was to be shown by a true and solid explanation of those articles, that our opinion did not differ from the words of Christ, nor from the articles themselves.

As to the phrases and modes of expression employed in this *Book of Concord*, when it treats of the majesty of the human nature in the person of Christ, being elevated and placed at the right hand of God, in order that all injurious misconceptions and offences may be entirely avoided, which might arise from the ambiguous nature of an *abstract* term,—since the schools and Fathers still use this expression,—our theologians wish to testify, in express and appropriate words, that such majesty of the human nature of Christ, independent of its personal union, must by no means be acknowledged; nor must it even be admitted, that the human nature possesses *per se* that majesty, either as a property or a power (even in the personal union) *essentialiter*, *formaliter*, *habitualiter*, or *subjective*, (for these terms are pleasing to the schools, though not very good Latin). For if we maintain this mode of speaking and of teaching, the divine and human natures will be confounded with their properties,—the human nature will be equivalent to the divine, in the mode of its essence and properties: indeed the whole will be denied.

Our theologians, therefore, maintain that they ought to be equal; that this takes place after the mode and dispensation of a union of distinct personalities, just as learned antiquity has cautiously treated this subject, presenting a mystery so great that it surpasses all the powers of our mind and understanding.

As to the condemnation, exposition, and rejection of impious doctrines, and especially of that which relates to the holy Supper, all indeed were to be expressly and distinctly presented in our Declaration, our profound explanation and determination of the controverted Articles, not only with the view, that all might avoid these condemned doctrines, but for some other reasons also, they were by no means to be omitted. So that it never was our design or resolution, to condemn those men who fall into error through an innocent simplicity of mind and yet are no blasphemers against the truth of divine doctrine, much less indeed, to condemn all the churches which are even under the Roman power in the German nation, or any place else; but it rather was our design and intention, publicly to reprehend and condemn, in this manner, all fanatical opinions, and the obstinate teachers of them, and those blasphemers, too, who we believe ought by no means to be endured in our dominions, our churches, and our schools; because those errors are repugnant to the express Word of God, and indeed so much repugnant, that they cannot be reconciled with it. For this reason too, we undertook this work, that all pious men might be warned to avoid these errors with great circumspection. For we have not the least doubt, that many pious men, the freest indeed from all evil, even in these churches, which have not as yet agreed in all points with us, are influenced merely by their own simplicity, and do not duly understand the subject itself, but by no means approve the blasphemies which are poured out against the holy Supper, as it is administered in our churches, according to the institution of Christ, and taught with great unanimity among all good men, according to the words of the Testament itself. We are in great hope too, that those men, rightly instructed in all these matters, and the Spirit of the Lord assisting them, will finally submit with us, and with our churches and schools, to the immutable truth of God's Word. And doubtless this duty is incumbent upon all theologians and ministers of the church,—that they teach, at the risk of their salvation, the principles which it becomes us to teach with moderation from the Word of God, to those, who, from simplicity of nature, or from ignorance, wander from the truth; and that they fortify them against corruptions,—lest while the blind are leaders of the blind, all be exposed to danger. Wherefore, in the sight of Almighty God and before the holy church, we testify in this our writing, that it never was our intention, by this Formula of pious reconciliation, to cause disturbance or danger to those devout men, who are at this moment suffering persecution. For, influenced by Christian charity, as we have come at last into companionship of sorrow with them, so do we revolt at the persecution and unrelenting tyranny, which are exercised chiefly against those wretched men, and we detest such cruelty from our very heart. In no sense do we acquiesce in the profusion of that innocent blood, which without doubt will be required, with great severity; from those persecutors, in the tremendous judgment of the Lord, and before the tribunal of Christ; and these men, most assuredly, will then experience the heaviest retributions for their tyranny, and undergo the most dreadful punishments.

In these writings indeed, as we have mentioned above, it was always our design, that in our provinces, our dominions, our schools, and churches, no other doctrine should be uttered and carefully inculcated, than that which is founded upon the Word of God, and contained in the Augsburg Confession as well as in the Apology, and that doctrine indeed understood in its true and genuine sense; nor should opinions be admitted which conflict with these: in which design this Formula of Pacification has been instituted and adopted. We therefore finally profess and testify before God and all men, that, in the Declaration of the controverted Articles, of which mention has been made several times, we do not present any new confession, or confession different from that which was exhibited to Charles V., in the year 1530; but that we have desired to conduct our churches and schools, first indeed to the fountain of the holy Scriptures and to the Symbols, and then to the Confession of Augsburg, of which we have spoken already. And most pressinglly do we advise, that our youth first of all, who are educated for the sacred service of our churches and schools, be instructed faithfully and diligently in this, in order that our pure doctrine and profession of faith, may be retained and propagated among our posterity, the Holy Spirit extending them, until the glorious coming of Jesus Christ, our only Redeemer and Savior.

That such may be the result, and that we, versed in the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, may be assured of our doctrine and our Confession, and our minds and consciences filled to a greater extent with the grace of the Holy Spirit, we have resolved to publish this *Book of Concord*. For it seemed most indispensably necessary, that a pious exposition and arrangement of all those controverted points, deduced from the Word of God, should appear in the midst of so many rising errors in our times, as well as so many offences, contentions, and perpetual broils, in order that, according to its principles, the pure doctrine might be distinguished and separated from the false. This design will moreover effect this result, that turbulent and contentious men will not be free, in proportion to their inclination, to excite controversies, inseparable from offence, nor, as they do not suffer themselves to be attached to any formula of pure doctrine, to propose and propagate enormous errors. For, from these opinions it will at last follow, that the pure doctrine will be obscured and lost, and nothing be transmitted to posterity but vague opinions and academical restrictions. To this may be added what we know to be due from us, in this way, to our subjects, in consequence of the duty which God has enjoined upon us, that we carefully regard what may relate to the purposes of this life and of that which is to come, and labor to provide with great zeal, as far indeed as it can be done, what may contribute to the extension of the name and glory of God, to the propagation of his Word, from which alone salvation may be expected, to the peace and tranquillity of churches and schools, and to the general composure and consolation of agitated minds; especially when it is well known to us, that this salutary work of Christian Concord, has long been sought and expected, with serious prayers and fervent ardor, by many good and warm-hearted men of the highest and lowest order; and not even from the commencement of this work of Pacification, were we in the belief, nor indeed are we now, that this salutary and indispensable work of Concord should be withdrawn and entirely concealed from the eyes of men, and that the light

of divine truth should be placed under a bushel or a table; wherefore, we were bound not to defer an edition of it any longer. For we do not doubt that pious men, who are fond of divine truth and of that harmony which is pleasing to God, will approve in conjunction with us, our salutary, useful, pious, and very necessary undertaking, and will not permit that any thing, even to the utmost exertion, shall be wanting in them for the extension of the glory of God, and for the public benefit which may result in eternal or temporal respects.

To mention that again of which we have spoken so often already, we certainly by no means have desired to mingle new principles with this work of Concord, or in any manner to depart from the truth of the divine doctrine which our ancestors, most venerable for their piety, as ourselves also, have acknowledged and professed. But we know that this doctrine, which is deduced from the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, is comprised in the *three ancient Symbols*, in the *Confession of Augsburg* exhibited to the emperor Charles V., then in the *Apology*, which has been connected with this, in the *Articles of Smalcald*, and lastly, in the *two Catechisms* of the excellent Dr. Luther. Wherefore, we have determined not to depart a finger's breadth either from the subjects or the phrases employed in them, but assisted by the Spirit of God, to persist constantly with the greatest concord in this pious conformity, examining all controversies by this true rule and declaration of the pure doctrine. And then we resolved to cultivate peace and harmony with the other electors, princes, and estates of the sacred Roman empire, and with other kings, princes, and nobles of a Christian commonwealth, according to the constitutions and ratified treaties of the sacred empire, which exist between them and ourselves, and to tender and present our services with our good wishes, to each one in proportion to the degree of his dignity and rank.

Having communicated our designs, we shall moreover attend most industriously to this also,—that we may defend with great strictness and zeal this work of Concord in our dominions, by careful examinations of churches and of schools, and inspection of printing offices, and finally by other judicious means, observing the occasions and circumstances which may promote our interest or that of others. If the controversies now quieted should revive, or new ones arise on the subject of religion, we shall labor, for a timely prevention of offences, to have them entirely dispelled or composed without long and dangerous agitations.

In full evidence of all this, we have subscribed our names with great unanimity, and affixed our signatures.

Lewis, Palatine of the Rhine, Elector.

Augustus, Duke of Saxony, Elector.

John George, Margrave of Brandenburg, Elector.

Joakin Frederick, Margrave of Brandenburg, Administrator of the Archbishopric of Magdeburg.

John, Bishop of Meissen.

Everard, Bishop of Lubeck, Adm'r. of the Episcopacy of Verdun.

Philip Lewis, Palatine of the Rhine.

The Tutors of Frederick William, and John, Dukes of Saxony.

The Tutors of John Casimir and John Ernest, Dukes of Saxony.

George Frederick, Margrave of Brandenburg.

Julius, Duke of Brunswick and Lunenburg.

Otho, Duke of Brunswick and Lunenburg.

Henry the younger, Duke of Brunswick and Lunenburg.

- William the younger, Duke of Brunswick and Luneburg.
 Wolfgang, Duke of Brunswick and Luneburg.
 Ulrick, Duke of Mecklenburg.
 The Guardians of John and Sigismund Augustus, Dukes of Mecklenburg.
 Lewis, Duke of Württemberg.
 The Guardians of Ernest and Jacob, Margraves of Baden.
 George Ernest, Count and Lord of Henneburg.
 Frederick, Count of Württemberg and Mümpelgart.
 John Gunter, Count of Schwartzenburg.
 William, Count of Schwartzenburg.
 Albert, Count of Schwartzenburg.
 Emic, Count of Leiningen.
 Philip, Count of Hanau.
 Godfrey, Count of Oettingen.
 George, Count and Lord in Castel.
 Henry, Count and Lord in Castel.
 Otto, Count of Hohen and Bruchhausen.
 John, Count of Oldenburg and Delmenhorst.
 John Hoier, Count of Mansfeld.
 Bruno, Count of Mansfeld.
 Hoier Christopher, Count of Mansfeld.
 Peter Ernest (junior,) Count of Mansfeld.
 Christopher, Count of Mansfeld.
 Albert George, Count of Stolburg.
 Wolfgang Ernest, Count of Stolburg.
 Lewis, Count of Gliichen.
 Charles, Count of Gliichen.
 Ernest, Count of Reinstein.
 Boto, Count of Reinstein.
 Lewis, Count of Leonstein.
 Henry, Baron of Limburg.
 George, Baron of Schönburg.
 Wolfgang of Schönburg.
 Anare Frederick, Baron of Wildenfels.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Lubeck.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Lüneburg.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Hamburg.
 The Aldermen of Brunswick.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Landau.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of the Province of the Monastery, in the Valley of Gregory.
 The Aldermen of Goslar.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Ulm.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Eslingen.
 The Aldermen of Reutlingen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Nördlingen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Rotenburg, near Tuber.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Seveor.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Heilbronn.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Memmingen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Lindau.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Schweinfurt.
 The Aldermen of Donawerth.
 The Chamberlain and Aldermen of Ratisbon.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Wimpfen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Gieningen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Bopfingen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Alen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Kaufbeuren.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Isna.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Campen.
 The Aldermen of Göttingen.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Leutkirch.
 The Aldermen of Hildesheim.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Hamel.
 The Mayor and Aldermen of Hannover.
 The Aldermen of Mulhausen.
 The Aldermen of Erfurt.
 The Aldermen of Einbeck.
 The Aldermen of Northcim.

THE
THREE CHIEF SYMBOLS;
OR
CONFESSIONS OF CHRISTIAN FAITH,
UNANIMOUSLY TAUGHT IN THE CHURCH.

THE THREE CHIEF SYMBOLS.

I. THE APOSTOLICAL CONFESSION OR SYMBOL, CONTAINING THE BASIS OF THE CHRISTIAN FAITH.

I believe in God the Father, Almighty Maker of heaven and earth.

And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended into hell; on the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, in a holy Christian church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. Amen.

II. THE NICENE CONFESSION OR SYMBOL.

I believe in one God only, the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth, and of all things visible and invisible.

And in one Lord Jesus Christ, the only-begotten Son of God, begotten of his Father before all worlds; God of God, Light of Light, very God of very God, begotten, not made, consubstantial with the Father, by whom all things were made; who for us men, and for our salvation, came down from heaven, and was incarnate by the Holy Ghost of the Virgin Mary, and was made man, and was crucified also for us, under Pontius Pilate. He suffered and was buried, and the third day he rose again, according to the Scriptures, ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father; and he shall come again, with glory, to judge both the living and the dead; whose kingdom shall have no end.

And I believe in the Holy Ghost, the Lord and Giver of life,

who proceeds from the Father and the Son ; who with the Father and the Son, is worshipped and glorified ; who spoke by the Prophets. And I believe in one holy Christian Apostolic church. I acknowledge one baptism for the remission of sins ; and I look for the resurrection of the dead, and life in the world to come. Amen.

III. THE ATHANASIAN CONFESSION OR SYMBOL,

DIRECTED AGAINST THE ARIANS.

Whosoever will be saved, before all things it is necessary that he hold the true Christian faith. Which faith except every one do keep whole and undefiled, without doubt he shall perish everlastingly.

But this is the true Christian faith : That we worship one God only, in Trinity, and Trinity in Unity, neither confounding the persons, nor dividing the essence. For there is one person of the Father, another of the Son, and another of the Holy Ghost. But the Godhead of the Father, of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost, is one : equal in Glory, co-eternal in Majesty. Such as the Father is, such is the Son, and such is the Holy Ghost. The Father is uncreated, the Son uncreated, the Holy Ghost uncreated. The Father is incomprehensible [unlimited], the Son incomprehensible, and the Holy Ghost incomprehensible. The Father is eternal, the Son eternal, the Holy Ghost eternal. And yet there are not three eternals, but one eternal. So also there are not three uncreated Beings, nor three incomprehensible Beings ; but one uncreated, and one incomprehensible. So likewise the Father is Almighty, the Son Almighty, and the Holy Ghost Almighty. And yet there are not three Almightyies, but one Almighty. So the Father is God, the Son is God, and the Holy Ghost is God. And yet there are not three Gods, but one God. So likewise the Father is Lord, the Son Lord, and the Holy Ghost Lord. And yet, not three Lords, but one Lord. For as we, according to Christian truth, must acknowledge every person by itself to be God and Lord, so we are forbidden by the Christian religion to say there are three Gods, or three Lords. The Father is neither made of any one, nor created, nor begotten. The Son is of the Father alone, not made, nor created, but *begotten*. The Holy Ghost is of the Father and of the Son, neither made, nor created, nor begotten, but *proceeding*. So there is one Father, not three Fathers ; one Son, not three Sons ; one Holy Ghost, not three Holy Ghosts. And in this Trin-

ity none is afore, or after the other ; none is greater, or less than another ; but the whole three persons together are co-eternal, and co-equal. So that in all things, as aforesaid, the Unity in Trinity, and the Trinity in Unity, is to be worshipped. He therefore that will be saved, must thus think of the Trinity.

✓ Furthermore, it is necessary to everlasting salvation, to believe rightly also in the incarnation of our Lord Jesus Christ. For the right faith is, that we believe and confess that our Lord Jesus Christ, the Son of God, is GOD and MAN : GOD, of the essence of the Father, begotten before the worlds ; and MAN, of the substance of his mother, born in the world ; perfect God, and perfect man, of a reasonable soul and human flesh subsisting : equal to the Father as touching his Godhead, and inferior to the Father as touching his humanity. Who, although he be God and man, is yet not two, but one Christ ;—one, not by conversion of the Godhead into flesh, but by taking of the humanity into God ;—one altogether ; not by confusion of substance, but by unity of person. For as the reasonable soul and flesh is one man, so God and man is one Christ ; who suffered for our salvation, descended into hell, and rose again the third day from the dead. He ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of the Father, God Almighty : whence he shall come to judge the living and the dead. At whose coming all men shall rise again with their bodies, and shall give account of their works. And they that have done good shall go into life everlasting, and they that have done evil into everlasting fire.

This is the true Christian faith, which, except a man believe faithfully, he cannot be saved.

THE
UNALTERED AUGSBURG CONFESSION;
OR
CONFESSION OF THE FAITH

OF

SEVERAL PRINCES AND ESTATES, DELIVERED TO HIS IMPERIAL MAJESTY, CHARLES V.,

AT

THE DIET OF AUGSBURG,

A. D. 1530.

OUR CONFESSION OF FAITH.

Archbishop Laurence, of the Episcopal Church, says: "The Augsburg Confession will ever remain one of the master-pieces of the human mind, enlightened by the Spirit of God."

D'Aubigne, the great Reformed Church historian, says: "It is pre-eminently the greatest and most glorious confession of Protestant Christianity."

A Roman Catholic Bishop, of Augsburg says: "All that the Lutherans have said is true; and we cannot deny it."

Dr. Eck, a Roman Catholic, says: "We cannot confute it (the Lutheran Confession) with the writings of the Apostles and Prophets."

The Duke of Bavaria, also a Catholic, said: "The Lutherans are entrenched in the Scriptures, and we (the Romanists) are aside of them."

Martin Luther, with prophetic vision, said: "This holy confession of Christ will penetrate into every court, and the sound thereof will go through all the earth." This has already come to pass; our confession has been translated into eighty languages, and is preached every Sunday to fifty-five millions of Lutherans.

THE UNALTERED AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

ADDRESS TO THE EMPEROR, CHARLES V.

Illustrious Emperor, most powerful, invincible, and gracious Sire : Inasmuch as your Imperial Majesty proclaimed a diet of the Empire at Augsburg, to consult about the best means of defence against the Turk, that ancient, inveterate, and most bitter enemy of the Christian name and religion,—in what way most completely and permanently to repress him ;—and then to consult also about the dissensions in reference to our holy religion and Christian faith,—how the opinions and sentiments of contending parties on the subject of religion, might be mutually expressed, explained, and considered among themselves in your presence, with moderation, mildness, and affection ; so that what has been considered or acknowledged by each party in its writings, being abandoned or corrected, those opinions might be settled and reduced to one plain standard of truth and Christian harmony ; that one pure and true religion being cherished and preserved among us, we may be able to live in harmony and concord in one Christian church, in the same manner as we live and serve under one Christ : and since we, the undersigned Elector and Princes, with others who have adhered to us, and other electors, princes, and estates besides, were summoned to the appointed diet, we therefore have come without delay to Augsburg, that we might obediently observe your Majesty's order, and, we wish it to be said without boasting, have appeared here among the first.

When, therefore, your Imperial Majesty, among other things, caused it to be proposed to the electors, princes, and other estates of the empire, at the very commencement of the Diet here at Augsburg, that the several estates, in conformity with your Imperial Edict, should prepare and submit their opinions and sentiments in the German and Latin language,—having held a consultation on Wednesday, we returned our answer, that we on our part would present the articles of our Confession to your Imperial Majesty on the succeeding Friday. In obedience to your Majesty's demand, we now offer in defence of our religion, the Confession of our adherents and ourselves, the doctrine of which, drawn from the holy Scriptures and the pure Word of God, they deliver in our provinces, dukedoms, principalities, and cities, and discuss in our churches.

For if the other electors, princes, and estates of the empire, in similar writings in Latin and German, according to the above-mentioned proposition of your Majesty, shall produce their opinions on the subject of religion, we, here in the presence of your Imperial Majesty, as our most gracious lord, present ourselves ready to consult on friendly terms with those princes and our adherents, about the possible methods and means by which we may come to an agreement, so far as it can be honorably done : and, hav-

ing peaceably discussed the subjects of difference among ourselves, to consult how the dissensions may be suppressed, through the grace of God, and how one true, harmonious religion may be preserved; that, as we all live and serve under one Christ, and ought to acknowledge one Christ, according to the tenor of your Majesty's Edict, all opinions likewise may be conformed to the standard of divine truth,—an event which we implore from God in our most fervent supplications.

But relative to the other electors, princes, and estates, as the opposite party, if this conference on the subject of religion, conducted after the manner in which your Majesty wisely required it to be,—by a mutual exhibition and deliberate comparison of written opinions among ourselves,—shall not conduce to a reconciliation, nor be attended with any other beneficial result, we at least shall leave the clearest evidence, and your Imperial Majesty, the electors, and estates of the empire, and all,—whoever are influenced by a pure love and zeal for religion, whoever may have heard this discussion with an impartial spirit,—will not fail to perceive, and gladly acknowledge, from our Confession, that we have withheld no effort which might contribute to the restoration of Christian harmony, consistent with the will of God and the dictates of conscience.

Your Imperial Majesty graciously intimated, not on a single occasion, but frequently, to the electors, princes, and estates of the empire, and caused it to be publicly read and recited from a copy of your Majesty's Instructions, written and communicated to them at the Diet of Speyer, held in the year 1526, that your Imperial Majesty, for certain reasons then specified, was neither willing nor able to make any decision or determination as to these religious difficulties; but that your Majesty desired, as a matter of duty, to use your best exertions with the Roman Pontiff for convening a general council. The same likewise was more fully declared, a year ago, in the last public diet which was held at Speyer. At that time your Imperial Majesty, through Ferdinand, king of Bohemia and Hungary, our friend and gracious lord, and also through your Majesty's speaker and commissaries, caused this to be declared among other things, that your Majesty had considered the resolution of the deputy, counsellors, and officers of the imperial government, and of those delegated by other estates, who had assembled at Ratisbon, and that your Majesty deemed it expedient to convene a diet; and because the subjects then under negotiation between your Majesty and the Roman Pontiff, were near an amicable adjustment, your Majesty did not doubt that the Pope might be induced to convoke a general diet. Thus earnestly did your Majesty strive that the chief Pontiff above-mentioned might agree with your Majesty to assemble such a diet, to be convoked by a majority, at an early period.

In the event, therefore, that the dissension between the parties, shall not be settled in a friendly and affectionate manner, we propose in all obedience, that we appear before your Imperial Majesty, abundantly prepared, and plead our cause in such a general, free, and Christian council, the convocation of which has always been solicited with one consent, and voted for with unanimous voices, by the electors, princes, and estates of the empire, in all the imperial diets which have been held during your Majesty's reign. Long ago in a becoming manner and in legal form, have we chal-

lenged them to a general conference of this kind, and appealed at the same time to your Imperial Majesty, in this great and momentous cause.

In this appeal to your Majesty for a general diet we continue to persist; nor do we intend nor are we able to abandon it, in this or any other address, unless the difficulty between the parties, according to your Majesty's last Proclamation, shall be settled, allayed, and adjusted to Christian harmony. And here we solemnly and publicly attest the truth of this declaration.



ARTICLES OF FAITH AND DOCTRINE.

ARTICLE I.—OF GOD.

Our churches unanimously hold and teach, agreeably to the Decree of the Council of Nice, that there is only one Divine Essence, which is called, and truly is, God; but that there are three persons in this one Divine Essence, equally powerful, equally eternal,—God the Father, God the Son, God the Holy Ghost,—who are one Divine Essence, eternal, incorporeal, indivisible, infinite in power, wisdom, and goodness, the Creator and Preserver of all things visible and invisible. And the word *person* is not intended to express a part or quality of another, but that which subsists of itself, precisely as the Fathers have employed this term on this subject.

Every heresy opposed to this Article is therefore condemned: as that of the Manichæans, who assume two principles, the one good, the other evil. Likewise the heresies of the Valentinians, Arians, Eunomians, Mahometans, and the like; also that of the ancient and modern Samosatensians, who admit but one person, and sophistically explain away these two,—the Word and the Holy Spirit,—asserting, that they must not be viewed as distinct persons, but that the Word signifies the oral word or voice, and that the Holy Ghost is the principle of motion in things.

ARTICLE II.—OF ORIGINAL SIN.

We teach, that since the fall of Adam all men who are naturally engendered, are conceived and born in sin; that is, that they all are from their mother's womb, full of evil desires and propensities, and can have by nature no true fear of God, no true faith in God; and that this innate disease, or original sin, is truly sin, which brings all those under the eternal wrath of God, who are not born again by Baptism and the Holy Spirit.

Hence, we condemn the Pelagians and others, who deny that original corruption is sin, whereby they assert, to the disparagement of the merits and sufferings of Christ, that piety is the result of our natural powers.

ARTICLE III.—OF THE SON OF GOD.

It is taught likewise, that God the Son became man, and was born of the blessed Virgin Mary; and that the two natures, human and divine, inseparably united in one person, are one Christ, who is true God and man, who was really born, who truly suffered, was crucified, died, and was buried, that he might be a sacrifice, not only for original sin, but also for all other sins, and might appease the wrath of God. Further, that this same Christ descended into hell, and truly arose from the dead on the third day, ascended to heaven, and sits at the right hand of God, that he may perpetually reign over all creatures, and govern them, through the Holy Spirit sanctify, purify, strengthen, and console all those who believe in him, and give unto them life and various gifts and blessings, and protect and defend them against the devil and the power of sin.

Also, that finally this same Christ will return visibly, to judge the living and the dead, &c., according to the Apostles' Creed.

ARTICLE IV.—OF JUSTIFICATION.

It is taught further, that we cannot obtain righteousness and the forgiveness of sin before God by our own merits, works, and atonement; but that we obtain the remission of sins, and are justified before God, by grace, for Christ's sake, through faith, if we believe that Christ suffered for us, and that for his sake our sins are remitted unto us, and righteousness and eternal life are bestowed on us. For, God regards this faith and imputes it as righteousness in his sight, as Paul says, Rom. chap. 3 and 4.

ARTICLE V.—OF THE MINISTRY,

For the purpose of obtaining this faith, God has instituted the ministry, and given the Gospel and the Sacraments, through which, as means, he imparts the Holy Spirit, who in his own time and place, works faith in those that hear the Gospel, which teaches that through the merits of Christ, and not through our own merits, we have a merciful God, if we believe these things,

By this are condemned the Anabaptists and others, who teach that we receive the Holy Spirit in consequence of our own preparation, our thoughts and works, without the external word of the Gospel.

ARTICLE VI.—OF NEW OBEDIENCE.

It is also taught, that such faith must bring forth good fruits and good works, and that we must do all manner of good works, because of God's requirement and command; yet we must not put any confidence in these works, as meriting favor in the sight of God: for we receive forgiveness of sins and justification through faith in Christ, as Christ himself says, Luke 17, 10: "When ye shall have done all those things, say, we are unprofitable servants." Thus also the Fathers teach. For Ambrose says: "Thus it has been ordained of God, that whosoever believes in Christ shall be saved; not through works, but without merit through faith alone, he has forgiveness of sins."

ARTICLE VII.—OF THE CHURCH.

It is taught likewise, that one holy Christian church shall ever continue to exist, which is the congregation of all believers, among whom the Gospel is preached in its purity, and the holy sacraments are administered according to the Gospel. For this is sufficient for the true unity of the Christian church, that the Gospel is preached therein, according to its pure intent and meaning, and that the sacraments are administered in conformity with the Word of God. And for the true unity of the Christian church it is not necessary, that uniform ceremonies instituted by men, should be every where observed. As Paul says, Ephes. 4, 4, 5: "There is one body, and one spirit, even as ye are called in one hope of your calling; one Lord, one faith, one baptism."

ARTICLE VIII.—WHAT THE CHURCH IS.

Further: although the Christian church is properly nothing else than the congregation of all believers and saints, yet, as in this life there are many hypocrites and false Christians,—open sinners remaining even among the pious,—the sacraments, nevertheless, are effectual, even if the preachers by whom they are administered, be not pious, as Christ himself says, Matt. 23, 2: "The Scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat," &c.

On this account the Donatists are condemned, and all such as teach contrary to this Article.

ARTICLE IX.—OF BAPTISM.

Respecting Baptism it is taught, that it is necessary; that grace is offered through it; and that children ought to be baptized, who through such baptism are presented to God, and become acceptable to him.

Therefore the Anabaptists are condemned, who teach that Infant Baptism is improper.

These see Part 22 of Confession

ARTICLE X.—OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Concerning the holy Supper of the Lord it is taught, that the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, under the form of bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper, and are there administered and received. The opposite doctrine is therefore rejected.

388-
384

ARTICLE XI.—OF CONFESSION.

In reference to confession it is taught, that private absolution ought to be retained in the church, and should not be discontinued; in confession, however, it is unnecessary to enumerate all transgressions and sins, which indeed is not possible. Psalm 19, 12: "Who can understand his errors?"

ARTICLE XII.—OF REPENTANCE.

Concerning repentance it is taught, that those who have sinned after baptism, may at all times obtain forgiveness of their sins, if they repent; and that the church should not refuse to grant absolution unto them. Genuine and true repentance properly consists in contrition and sorrow, or terror on account of sin; besides, it consists in faith in the Gospel or absolution,—namely, that sins are forgiven and grace is obtained through Christ,—a faith which consoles and imparts peace to the heart.

Afterwards amendment of conduct also should follow, and abstinence from sin; for these should be the fruits of repentance, as John says, Matt. 3, 8: "Bring forth fruits meet for repentance."

Here are condemned such as teach, that those who have once been justified can never fall.

On the other hand, the Novatians also are here condemned, who refused absolution to those who had sinned after baptism.

Those in like manner are condemned who teach, that forgiveness of sin is obtained, not through faith, but through our own merits.

ARTICLE XIII.—OF THE USE OF THE SACRAMENTS.

Concerning the use of the sacraments it is taught, that the sacraments have been instituted, not only as tokens by which Christians may be known externally, but as signs and evidences of the Divine will towards us, for the purpose of exciting and strengthening our faith; hence they also require faith, and they are properly used then only, when received in faith, and when faith is strengthened by them.

p. 266
Use of the sacraments, p. 296.

ARTICLE XIV.—OF CHURCH GOVERNMENT.

Concerning church government it is taught, that no one should teach or preach publicly in the church, or administer the sacraments, without a regular call.

Licence, see p. 750 - Clipp.

ARTICLE XV.—OF CHURCH RITES AND ORDINANCES.

Concerning ecclesiastical rites instituted by men it is taught, that those should be observed which can be so observed without sin, and which promote peace and good order in the church: as, certain holidays, festivals, and the like. Respecting these, however, our instruction is designed to release the consciences of men from the idea, that such observances are essential to salvation. It is taught on this point, that all ordinances and traditions of men, for the purpose of reconciling God and meriting grace, are contrary to the Gospel and the doctrine of faith in Christ; wherefore, monastic vows, and traditions concerning the difference of meats, days, &c., intended for the purpose of meriting grace and making satisfaction for sins, are impotent and contrary to the Gospel.

ARTICLE XVI.—OF CIVIL POLITY AND GOVERNMENT.

Concerning civil polity and government it is taught, that all authority in the world, established governments and laws, are good and divine; that Christians may hold either legislative, judicial,

or executive offices, without sin; and may decide cases, pronounce judgments, and punish transgressors, agreeably to imperial or other established laws; may wage just wars, and serve in them; make lawful contracts; take oaths, when required; may hold property, marry, and be married, &c.

The Anabaptists are here condemned, who teach, that none of these things now mentioned, are consistent with Christianity.

Those likewise are condemned, who teach, that Christian perfection consists in literally deserting house and home, wife and children, and relinquishing them; when at the same time true perfection consists only in true fear of God, and in true faith in God. For the Gospel does not teach an external, temporary, but an internal, lasting habit and righteousness of heart; nor does it invalidate civil government, polity, and matrimony; but it requires the observance of all these, as true ordinances of God. And in such stations, each one according to his vocation, should manifest Christian love and genuine good works. Christians are therefore under obligation to submit to government, and to obey its commands in all things that may be performed without sin; but if government should enjoin any thing which cannot be obeyed without sin, "we ought to obey God rather than men," Acts 4, 19, and 5, 29.

ARTICLE XVII.—OF CHRIST'S RETURN TO JUDGMENT.

It is also taught, that on the last day our Lord Jesus Christ will come to raise and to judge all the dead, to give unto the believing and elect eternal life and endless joys; and that he will come to condemn impious men and devils to hell and everlasting punishment.

The Anabaptists are rejected, who teach that devils and condemned men shall not suffer everlasting pain and torment.

Here, in like manner, certain Jewish doctrines are condemned, which are circulated even now, that prior to the resurrection of the dead, the holy and pious alone will occupy a temporal kingdom, and that all the wicked will be exterminated.

ARTICLE XVIII.—OF FREEWILL.

Concerning freewill it is taught, that to some extent man has freedom of will, to lead a life outwardly honest, and to choose between things which reason comprehends; but without the grace, assistance, and operation of the Holy Spirit, that he is unable to be-

come pleasing to God, or to fear God in heart, or to believe in him, or to cast out of his heart innate evil; and that these things are effected through the Holy Spirit, who is given through the Word of God; for Paul says, 1 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God."

And in order that it may be known, that nothing new is taught in this Article, the expressive words of Augustine, concerning free-will, are introduced here, as transcribed from the *Hypognosticon*, lib. III.: "We acknowledge, that in all men there is a free-will; for they all, indeed, have natural, connate understanding and reason; not that they are able to act in things pertaining to God, such as to love and fear God from the heart; but only in external works of this life have they freedom to choose good or evil. By good I mean, that which nature is able to perform, as to labor in the field, or not; to eat, to drink, to visit a friend, or not; to clothe or unclothe, to build, to take a wife, to carry on a trade, and to do any similar act that is useful and good; none of which, however, either occurs or takes place without God, but each takes place of Him and through Him. On the contrary, from his own choice, man may also engage in evil, as to bow down before an idol, to commit murder," &c.

ARTICLE XIX.—OF THE CAUSE OF SIN,

As to the cause of sin, it is taught among us, that, although Almighty God has created and preserves all nature, yet the perverted will works sin in all evil-doers and despisers of God, even as the will of the devil and of all wicked men, which, as soon as God withdraws his aid, turns itself from God unto evil, as Christ says, John 8, 44: "When he speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own,"

ARTICLE XX.—OF FAITH AND GOOD WORKS, -

Art. VI. of the Augsburg Confession - P 182 -
Art. VI. of the Augsburg Confession - P 641 -

We are falsely accused of having prohibited good works: but our writings on the Ten Commandments and other subjects, show that we have given good and useful instructions and admonitions in respect to various Christian relations, duties, and works; respecting which, prior to this time, little had been taught, but almost every sermon urged continually the necessity of puerile and needless works,—as rosaries, worship of saints, monastic vows, pilgrimages, stated fasts, holidays, fraternities, &c. Works so needless, even our opponents do not extol so highly now as formerly: besides, they

have also learned to treat of faith now, concerning which in former times they preached nothing at all; they teach now, however, that we are not justified before God by works alone, but add faith in Christ, saying faith and works justify us before God,—a doctrine which may afford more consolation than one teaching confidence in works alone.

Now the doctrine concerning faith, which is the principal article in the Christian Creed, not having been inculcated for so long a time, as all must confess, but the doctrine concerning works alone having been preached every where, the following instructions on this subject are offered by our divines:

First, that our works cannot reconcile us to God and merit grace, but these things are effected through faith alone, if we believe that our sins are forgiven us for Christ's sake, who alone is the Mediator reconciling the Father. He, therefore, that expects to effect this reconciliation by works, and to merit grace, contemns Christ and seeks a way of his own to God, contrary to the Gospel.

This doctrine of faith is clearly and explicitly inculcated by Paul in many places, especially in Ephes. 2, 8, 9: "By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast," &c. And that a new signification is not introduced here, may be shown from Augustine, who has treated this subject carefully, and who in like manner teaches, that we obtain grace and are justified before God, through faith in Christ, and not by works, as his whole book, "*De Spiritu et Litera*," clearly shows. Although this doctrine is despised very much by the thoughtless, yet it will be found that it is very consoling and salutary to timid and alarmed consciences; for our consciences cannot secure tranquillity and peace by works, but through faith alone, when they feel in themselves an assurance, that for Christ's sake they have a merciful God, as Paul says, Rom. 5, 1: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God." Heretofore this consolation was not administered in sermons, but the wretched consciences of men were driven upon works of their own, and various works were taken in hand; for conscience drove some into monasteries, with the hope of acquiring grace there by a monastic life; others devised works of another kind, for the purpose of meriting grace and of making satisfaction for sins. Many of these have experienced, that peace could not be secured by these things. It was, for this reason, necessary to preach and enforce with diligence this doctrine of faith in Christ, that it might be known that through faith alone, without merit, the grace of God is secured.

It is also inculcated, that the faith here spoken of, is not the faith which devils and the ungodly possess, who believe the historical fact, that Christ has suffered and risen from the dead; but it is the *true* faith,—the faith which believes that we obtain grace and the forgiveness of sins through Christ. And hence, whoever knows that he has a merciful God through Christ, knows God, calls upon him, and is not without God, like the Gentiles. For the devil and the ungodly do not believe the article concerning the remission of sins; for this reason they are enemies to God, unable to call upon him, or to hope for any thing good from him; and, as just now shown, the Scripture speaking of faith, does not style faith such a knowledge as devils and wicked men possess; for it is taught concerning faith, in Hebrews 11, 1, that to have merely a knowledge of the facts of history is not faith, but to have confidence in God that we shall receive his promises. And Augustine also reminds us, that we should understand the word *faith* in Scripture, to mean a confidence in God that he is merciful to us, and not a mere knowledge of the fact,—a knowledge which devils also possess.

It is taught further, that good works should and must be performed, not with a view of placing confidence in them as meriting grace, but in accordance with his will, and for the glory of God. Faith alone constantly secures grace and forgiveness of sins. And because the Holy Spirit is given through faith, the heart becomes qualified to perform good works. For before this, while it is without the Holy Spirit, it is too weak; besides it is in the power of Satan, who urges frail human nature to many sins: as we see among the philosophers, who resolving to live honorably and unblamably, were unable to effect it, and fell into many great and open sins. So it happens with all men who attempt, without true faith and without the Holy Spirit, to govern themselves by their own strength alone. Wherefore, the doctrine concerning faith does not deserve censure as discouraging good works, but should much rather be applauded as teaching the performance of good works, and as offering assistance by which good works may be performed. For without faith, and out of Christ, the nature and ability of man are much too weak to do good works, to call upon God, to have patience in sufferings, to love his neighbor, faithfully to execute commissions, to be obedient, to avoid evil lusts. Such exalted and righteous works cannot be performed without the assistance of Christ, as he himself says, John 15, 5: "Without me, ye can do nothing."

ARTICLE XXI.—OF THE WORSHIP OF SAINTS,

Concerning the worship of saints it is taught by us, that we should remember the saints, in order to strengthen our faith when we see how grace was conferred on them, and how assistance was afforded them through faith; and also to derive examples from their good works for every vocation; even as your Imperial Majesty in waging war against the Turks, may follow successfully and devoutly the example of David; for both hold royal offices, the shelter and protection of which subjects require. But from Scripture it cannot be shown, that we should invoke the saints, or seek help from them. For there is but one Reconciler and Mediator appointed between God and man, Jesus Christ, 1 Tim. 2, 5, who is the only Savior, High Priest, Propitiator, and Intercessor before God, Rom. 3, 25, and 8, 34. He alone has promised us to hear our prayers; and the highest worship according to the Scripture is, to seek and call on Jesus Christ from the heart, in every necessity and affliction; 1 John 2, 1: "If any man sin, we have an Advocate with the Father, Jesus Christ the righteous."

This is about the substance of the doctrine which is preached and taught in our churches, for the due instruction, Christian edification, peace of conscience, and improvement of believers. For, as we did not feel willing to place in the greatest and most imminent danger before God our own souls and consciences, by the abuse of the Divine Name and Word, or transmit to our children and descendants, and entail upon them, any other doctrine than that of the pure Divine Word and Christian truth; and as these doctrines are clearly taught in the holy Scripture, and besides, are neither contrary nor in opposition to the universal Christian, or to the Roman church, so far as may be observed from the writings of the Fathers, we think that our adversaries cannot disagree with us in the foregoing Articles. Those therefore act altogether unkindly, hastily, and contrary to all Christian unity and love, who resolve in themselves, without any authority of divine command or of Scripture, to exclude, reject, and avoid us all as heretics. For the controversy and contention principally refer to traditions and abuses. If, then, there is no real error or deficiency in the principal articles, and if this our Confession is scriptural and Christian, even were there error among us on account of traditions, the bishops should demean themselves more gently; but we hope to assign indisputable grounds and reasons, why some traditions and abuses have been corrected among us

ARTICLES

CONCERNING WHICH THERE IS DISSENSION, AND IN WHICH ARE
RELATED THE ABUSES WHICH HAVE BEEN CORRECTED.

Since, then, with respect to these Articles of faith, there is nothing taught in our churches contrary to the holy Scripture, or the universal church, but merely some abuses have been corrected,—a part of which in the course of time, have crept in of themselves,—and others have been established by force,—necessity requires us to state these, and to allege reasons why alterations in them were permitted, in order that your Imperial Majesty may know, that in this matter we have not acted in a manner unchristian or presumptuous, but that we have been urged to make such alterations by the command of God, whose commands should justly be esteemed higher than all customs.

ARTICLE XXII.—OF BOTH ELEMENTS IN THE EUCHARIST.

Among us, both elements in the Eucharist are administered to the laity, because this is a clear command and precept of Christ, Matt. 26, 27: “Drink *ye all* of it.” Here Christ commands in express words concerning the cup, that they all should drink of it. p 29

And in order that no one shall be able to cavil at these words, and explain them as pertaining to the priests alone, Paul informs us, 1 Cor. 11, 25, that the whole congregation of the Corinthian church used both elements. And this custom continued in the church for a long time, as can be shown from history and the writings of the Fathers. Cyprian mentions in many places, that in his time the cup was administered to the laity. Thus says St. Jerome: “The priests who administer the Sacrament, distribute the blood of Christ to the people.” And pope Gelasius himself commands, that the Sacrament should not be divided, *Distinct. 2, de Consecrat. cap. Comperimus*. Nor can any canon be found, which commands that one element alone should be received. And no one can ascertain, when or by whom the custom of receiving one element was introduced, although cardinal Cusanus mentions the time when this method was approved. Now it is evident that a custom, introduced contrary to the command of God, and in opposition to the ancient canons, is wrong. Wherefore, it was improper to oppress the consciences of those who wished to use the holy Sacrament according to the institution of Christ, by compelling them to act contrary to the order of Christ our Lord.

And since this practice of dividing the Sacrament is contrary to the institution of Christ, the usual procession* with the Sacrament is discontinued among us.

ARTICLE XXIII.—OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

There have been very great complaints in the world, among individuals both of high and of low rank, concerning the excessive lasciviousness, the dissolute life and conduct of the priests, who were unable to observe continence, and who had proceeded to the greatest excess in vice. For the purpose of avoiding such gross and detestable offences,—adultery, and other acts of sensuality,—some priests among us have entered a state of matrimony. These allege, that in taking this step, they have been urged and actuated by the dictates of conscience, since the Scripture expressly declares that marriage was instituted of the Lord God to prevent fornication, as Paul says, 1 Cor. 7, 2: “To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife.” Again, “It is better to marry than to burn,” 1 Cor. 7, 9. Christ declares: “All men cannot receive this saying,” Matt. 19, 11. In this passage Christ himself, who well knew the constitution of man, declares that few persons have the gift to live continent; “for God created them male and female,” Gen. 1, 27. Now experience has abundantly shown, whether it is within human power or ability, without a special gift or grace of God, to improve or change the creatures of God the Most High, by human purposes or vows. For it is evident, what good, what decent, chaste lives, what Christian, honest, or blameless conduct, have followed from this in many individuals! Ah! what abominable, hideous disquietudes and torments of their consciences, many have experienced in the close of their lives! Many of them have confessed it themselves. Since, then, the word and law of God cannot be altered by any human vows or enactments, the priests and other ecclesiastics, for these and other reasons and authorities, have entered into a state of matrimony.

So it may be shown likewise from history and the writings of the Fathers, that formerly in the Christian churches, it was customary for priests and deacons to have wives; wherefore Paul says, 1 Tim. 3, 2, “A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife.” It is but four hundred years since the priests in Germany were driven by force from a state of matrimony to vows of continence, and they

* This expression has reference to the processions with the host, on the festival of the Holy Body.—[TRANS.]

opposed that measure so generally, with so much earnestness and rigor, that the archbishop of Mayence, who published this new Papal Edict, was well nigh being murdered in a mob excited by the priests. And directly in the beginning, in a manner so precipitate and arbitrary was that decree enforced, that the Pope at that time did not only forbid priests to marry in future, but he also dissolved the marriage of those who had already been in that state for a long time,—an action which was not only contrary to all divine, natural, and civil rights, but in opposition also to the canons of the popes themselves, and to the most celebrated councils.

In like manner, among individuals of high standing, piety, and intelligence, have similar opinions and sentiments been heard frequently,—that this compulsory celibacy, this prohibition of matrimony, which God himself instituted and left optional, has never been productive of any good, but the source of many great and pernicious vices and excesses. And even one of the popes, Pius II., himself, as his history shows, often used these words, and permitted them to be written: “There may be some reasons, indeed, why marriage should be forbidden to the ecclesiastics; but there are much higher, greater, and weightier reasons why marriage should be left optional with them.” And doubtless, pope Pius, as an intelligent and wise man, spoke these words from mature consideration.

Wherefore we would in submission to your Imperial Majesty, comfort ourselves with the hope that your Majesty, as a Christian and highly esteemed Emperor, will reflect that now in these latter days, of which the Scripture makes mention, the world becomes still more degenerate, and mankind more sinful and weak.

For these reasons it is a highly necessary and Christian consideration, that we should be mindful, lest, by the prohibition of marriage, lasciviousness and other crimes more wicked and shameful, be promoted in the German states. For no one is able to encourage or regulate these matters better or more wisely than God himself, who has instituted marriage for the purpose of assisting human weakness, and of restraining licentiousness. Thus say the ancient canons too, that severity and rigor must on some occasions be mitigated and relaxed, on account of human weakness, and for the purpose of guarding against, and of avoiding greater evils.

Now such a course would in this case be Christian and very necessary. For what injury could result to the Christian church in general,—especially to the ministers and others, who are to serve in the church,—from the marriage of priests and ecclesiastics? There

will indeed be a want of priests and ministers hereafter, should this rigorous prohibition of marriage be continued longer.

Now, since the authority is founded upon the divine Word and commandment, for priests and ecclesiastics to enter into a state of matrimony; besides, since history shows that the priests did live in a state of matrimony; since also, the vows of continence have produced a very great number of offences so detestable and unchristian, adultery so excessive, licentiousness so terrible and unheard of, and vices so abominable, that even some of the courtiers among the dignitaries at Rome, have often confessed these things, and admitted with sorrow that, as these vices in the clergy were so abominable and predominant, the wrath of God would be excited,—it is indeed lamentable that the Christian state of matrimony has not only been forbidden, but even subjected, in some places, to the most severe punishment, as if it were a heinous crime.

Matrimony is moreover commended highly in imperial governments, and in every monarchy in which justice and law prevail. But in the present time innocent people are beginning to be tortured on account of their marriage, priests likewise who should be spared in preference to others,—a thing which is not only contrary to divine laws, but also to the canons. That doctrine which forbids marriage, the apostle Paul denominates a doctrine of devils, 1 Tim. 4, 1, 3. And Christ himself says, John 8, 44: “The devil is a murderer from the beginning.” All these things concur well to prove *that* to be a doctrine of devils, which forbids marriage, and attempts to enforce the prohibition by the shedding of blood.

But as no human law can abrogate or change a command of God, so a vow is not able to change his command. Wherefore Cyprian advises those women to marry who do not keep their chastity according to their vow, and he says, *lib. I. epist. II.*: “But if they will not preserve their chastity, or if they are unable, it is better to marry, than to fall into the fire through their lust: and they should be very careful not to occasion offence to the brethren and sisters.”

In addition to these considerations, all the canons extend more lenity and justice to those who have taken vows in youth, the priests and monks for the most part having through ignorance entered into this state in their youth.

ARTICLE XXIV.—OF THE MASS.

It is alleged unjustly against us, that we have abolished the mass. For it is well known that the mass is, without boasting, celebrated

with greater devotion and sincerity among us, than among our adversaries. So the people also are repeatedly instructed with diligence concerning the holy Eucharist, with regard to the purpose for which it was instituted, and the manner in which it is to be used, namely, to comfort alarmed consciences, by means of which the people are drawn to communion and mass. Besides, instruction is also given against wrong doctrines concerning the Sacrament. Nor has any perceptible change taken place in the public ceremonies of the mass, except that at several places German hymns, for the instruction and exercise of the people, are sung with the Latin hymns; especially as all ceremonies should serve the purpose of teaching the people what is necessary for them to know concerning Christ.

But as the mass, prior to this time, was abused in various ways; as it is clear, that an annual traffic was made out of it, that it was bought and sold, and that it was celebrated for the most part in all churches for the sake of money, such abuse had been repeatedly censured, even before this time, by individuals of learning and piety. Now, as the ministers among us have preached concerning this thing, and the priests have been reminded of the terrible menaces which should justly move every Christian, that whoever partakes of the Sacrament unworthily, is guilty of the body and blood of Christ, 1 Cor. 11, 27, in consequence of this, these sordid and solitary masses, which hitherto have been celebrated out of compulsion, for the sake of money and preferments, have ceased in our churches.

Besides, the abominable error that Christ our Lord by his death has atoned for original sin only, and that he has instituted the mass as a propitiation for other sins, is also censured. And thus the mass was converted into an oblation for the living and the dead, in order to take away sins, and to reconcile God. From this it followed as a further consequence, that it was made a question whether a mass held for many, merits as much as if a particular one is held for each individual. Thence originated a great diversity of masses, as men wished by that work to obtain from God all that they needed, and consequently faith in Christ and the true divine service were neglected.

Wherefore instruction is given on this subject, as necessity undoubtedly requires, in order that it may be known how the Sacrament should be rightly used. And first, the Scripture testifies in many places, that there is no sacrifice for original sin or for other sins, but the death of Christ. For thus it is written, Heb. 9, 26-28, and chap. 10, 10-14: "For by one offering Christ hath perfected forever them that are sanctified." It is an unparalleled innovation, to teach in the church that the death of Christ atoned only for ori-

ginal sin, and not for other sins also ; hope is therefore entertained, that it will be generally perceived that such error was not unjustly censured.

Secondly, St. Paul teaches, Rom. 3, 25, that we obtain grace before God, through faith, and not by works. Such abuse of the mass is evidently opposed to this doctrine, if by that means we expect to obtain grace ; as it is well known that the mass has been used for the purpose of removing sins, and of obtaining grace and favor before God, not only in behalf of the priest for himself, but also for the whole world, for the living and the dead.

Thirdly, this holy sacrament was instituted, not for the purpose of making a sacrifice for sins, (for the sacrifice has already been made,) but for the purpose of exciting our faith, and of consoling the consciences, which are admonished through the Sacrament that grace and the forgiveness of sins are promised to them by Christ. Wherefore this sacrament requires faith, and without faith it is used in vain.

Since, then, the mass is not a sacrifice for others, living or dead, to take away their sins, and since it should be a communion, in which the priest and others receive the Sacrament for themselves, the following custom is observed among us, that on holidays (and also at other seasons when communicants are present) mass is celebrated, and unto those who desire it the Sacrament is administered. Thus the mass continues among us in its proper application, as it was observed originally in the church, as may be shown from St. Paul, 1 Cor. 11, 33, and likewise from many writings of the Fathers. For Chrysostom mentions how the priest stands daily, requesting some to come to communion, and forbidding others to approach. The ancient canons also show, that one officiated, and the other priests and deacons communed. For thus read the words of the canon of Nice : "The deacons in order after the priests, should receive the Sacrament from the bishop or the priest."

Now, since no innovation has been introduced, inconsistent with the custom of the primitive church, and no perceptible change has taken place in the public ceremonies of the mass, except that the unnecessary masses, celebrated perhaps through abuse, together with the private or priest's masses, have discontinued, it would therefore be unjust to condemn this manner of holding mass as unchristian and heretical. For in times past, even when great numbers of people had assembled in large churches, the mass was not celebrated every day, as the *Historia Tripartita*, lib. 9, cap. XXXVIII., testifies. Again, in Alexandria the Scriptures were read and explained, on Wednesdays and Fridays, and all other divine services were held without the mass.

ARTICLE XXV.—OF CONFESSION.

Confession is not abolished by our ministers. For the custom is retained among us, not to administer the Sacrament unto those who have not been previously examined and absolved. The people, moreover, are diligently instructed with regard to the comfort afforded by the words of absolution, and the high and great estimation in which it is to be held; for it is not the voice or word of the individual present, but it is the word of God, who here forgives sins; for it is spoken in God's stead, and by his command. Concerning this command and power of the keys, it is taught with the greatest assiduity how comfortable, how useful they are to alarmed consciences, and besides how God requires confidence in this absolution, no less than if the voice of God was heard from heaven; and by this we comfort ourselves, and know that through such faith we obtain the remission of sins. Concerning these useful points, the priests, who taught respecting confession, formerly did not utter a single word, but merely tormented our consciences with long enumerations of sins, with expiations, with indulgences, with pilgrimages, and the like. And many of our adversaries themselves have acknowledged, that we write and treat of true Christian repentance with greater propriety than had been done before for many years.

And thus it is taught respecting confession, that no one should be forced to specify sins; for this would be impossible, as the Psalmist says: "Who can understand his errors?" Psalm 19, 13. And Jeremiah says: "The heart is deceitful above all things: who can know it?" Jer. 17, 9. Poor, frail human nature is plunged so deeply in sin, that it is unable to perceive or to acknowledge every sin; and should those sins alone be pardoned, which we are able to enumerate, it would avail us but little. It is, therefore, unnecessary to urge people to specify their sins. Thus the Fathers also maintained, as may be shown from *Distinct. 1, de Pœnitentia*, in which the words of Chrysostom are quoted: "I say not that thou shouldest betray thyself publicly, or accuse thyself before another one, or present thyself as culpable, but obey the Prophet, who says, 'Commit thy way unto the Lord,' Ps. 37, 5. Therefore confess unto God the Lord, the righteous judge, in thy prayer, do not relate thy sins with the tongue, but in thy conscience." Here it may be seen clearly, that Chrysostom does not insist upon our sins being enumerated by name. The *Glossa in Decretis de Pœnitentia, Distinct. 5, cap. Consideret*, also teaches that confession is not commanded in the Scriptures, but that it was instituted by the church. Yet by our ministers it is taught

with diligence, that confession, because of absolution, which is the chief part in it, should be retained for the purpose of consoling alarmed consciences, and for some other reasons.

ARTICLE XXVI.—OF DIVERSITY OF MEATS.

Formerly it was held, preached, and written, that the diversity of meats and the like ceremonies instituted by men, were useful, in order to merit grace, and to make satisfaction for sin. Hence new fasts, new ceremonies, new orders, and the like, were daily devised, strenuously insisted upon, as if they were necessary services to God, and that grace might be merited if they were observed, while to neglect them would be considered a great sin. From this many scandalous errors originated in the church.

In the first place, the grace of Christ and the doctrine concerning faith were by this means obscured, which doctrine with great solemnity the Gospel inculcates, and it insists with earnestness that the merits of Christ should be highly and dearly esteemed, and that it should be known that faith in Christ is to be placed far above all works. St. Paul, for this reason, inveighs bitterly against the Mosaic law and human traditions, in order to teach us, that we are not justified before God by our works, but alone through faith in Christ, and that we obtain grace for Christ's sake. This doctrine was almost entirely suppressed, by teaching that grace must be merited by the observance of laws, by fasts, and by diversities of meats and dress.

Secondly, such traditions even obscured the command of God. For men elevated these traditions far above his command. Those alone were believed to live as Christians, who observed these holidays, and prayed, and fasted, and dressed in a peculiar manner, which was styled a spiritual, Christian life.

Moreover, other good works were regarded as worldly and sensuous, namely, those which each one according to his vocation, is under obligation to do: as, a father laboring to support his wife and children, and bringing them up in the fear of God; a mother bearing children and attending to them; a prince and other authorities ruling the country and the people, &c. Such works commanded of God, were considered a mere worldly and imperfect matter; but these traditions were honored with the unmerited title of holy and perfect works. For these reasons there was neither limit nor end of such traditions:

Thirdly, these traditions became exceedingly oppressive to the consciences of men. For it is not possible to observe all traditions, and yet the people were of opinion that they are necessary services to God. And Gerson asserts in his writings that by this many were

driven to despair, and some put an end to their own existence, because they did not hear the consolation of the grace of Christ. For, how the consciences of men were entangled is seen from the Summists and the theologians, who attempted to sum up the traditions, and sought *επιεικείας** in order to assist those consciences. So entirely were they engrossed in this, that in the meantime the salutary Christian doctrines of subjects more important, of faith, of consolation in affliction, and the like, were totally neglected. Accordingly many excellent men of those times complained that these traditions excited much contention in the church, and by that means prevented pious men from attaining the true knowledge of Christ. Gerson and several others have uttered bitter complaints on this subject. And it also met the displeasure of Augustine, that men encumbered their consciences with so many traditions; on this subject therefore he advises that they should not be regarded as necessary things.

Wherefore, we did not treat on these matters, through malice or in contempt of ecclesiastical power, but necessity required instruction concerning the errors aforementioned, which had grown out of the misapprehension of these traditions. For the Gospel insists, that the doctrine concerning faith should and must be inculcated in churches; which cannot, however, be understood where the opinion prevails that men merit grace by works of their own contrivance. And with respect to this subject, it is taught that no one is able, by the observance of such human traditions, to merit grace or to reconcile God, or to atone for sins; and for this reason no necessary service of God should be made out of them. Reasons in addition are produced from Scripture. Christ excuses the Apostles for not observing the usual traditions, saying, Matt. 15, 3-9: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." Now as he calls this a vain service, it cannot be necessary. And immediately afterwards he says, verse 11: "Not that which goeth into the mouth defileth a man." Again, Paul says, Rom. 14, 17: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink." Col. 2, 16-20, "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day," &c. Peter says, Acts 15, 10, 11: "Why tempt ye God to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciples, which neither our fathers nor we were able to bear? But we believe that through the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ we shall be saved." Here Peter forbids that the consciences of men should be burdened any further

* The word *Epieikeia* properly signifies: equity, moderation, forbearance, reasonable condescension. This word was employed by the monks, to express the mitigation of the rigor of the precepts or traditions.—[TRANS.]

with external ceremonies, either with those of Moses or of others. And 1 Tim. 4, 1-3, those prohibitions which forbid meats and matrimony are called "doctrines of devils." For it is diametrically opposed to the Gospel, either to institute or perform such works for the purpose of meriting the remission of sins, or to do so under the impression that no one can be a Christian without these services.

The charge, however, alleged against us, that we forbid discipline and mortification of the flesh, as Jovinian did, is disproved by our writings. For we have ever given instruction concerning the holy cross, which Christians are under obligation to bear; and this is a true, sincere, not a fictitious mortification. Moreover it is taught in like manner, that every Christian is under obligation to restrain himself by bodily exercise, as fasting and other exercises, so that he give no occasion to sin,—not meriting grace however by these works. This bodily exercise should be urged not only on certain fixed days, but continually. On this subject Christ says, Luke 21, 34, "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting." Again, Matt. 17, 21, "The devils are not cast out but by fasting and prayer." And Paul says, 1 Cor. 9, 27, "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection." By this he shows, that mortification is designed, not for the purpose of meriting grace, but for the purpose of keeping the body in a suitable condition, that it may not impede what each one according to his calling is commanded to perform; and thus fasting is not rejected, but the making of a necessary service out of it, upon fixed days, and with particular meats, to the confusion of the consciences of men.

Many ceremonies and traditions are likewise observed by us; such as mass, singing of hymns, festivals, &c., which are calculated to promote order in the church. But relative to this subject the people are instructed, that such external service does not make them pious before God, and that it should be observed without encumbering their consciences, so that if any one omit it without giving offence, he does not sin in that case. This freedom in external ceremonies the ancient Fathers likewise retained. For in the East, the festival of Easter was held at a different time from that at Rome; and when some were disposed to consider this want of uniformity as a division in the church, they were reminded by others, that it was not necessary to observe uniformity in such things. And thus says Irenæus: "A difference of fasts does not destroy the agreement in matters of faith." So also in *Distinct.* 12, it is written concerning the want of uniformity in human ordinances, that it is not contrary to the unity of Christendom. And *Tripartita Historia*, lib. 9, sums up ma-

ny dissimilar church customs, and forms a useful Christian maxim : "It was not the intention of the Apostles to institute holidays, but to teach *faith* and *charity*."

ARTICLE XXVII.—OF MONASTIC VOWS.

When speaking of monastic vows, it is necessary, in the first place, to consider how they have been viewed hitherto ; what regulation they had in monasteries, and that very many things were daily done in them, not only contrary to the Word of God, but also in opposition to Papal laws. In the time of St. Augustine monastic life was optional ; subsequently, when the right discipline and doctrine were corrupted, monastic vows were devised, and by these, as a species of imprisonment, they wished to re-establish discipline.

In addition to these monastic vows, many other things were introduced, and with these burdens and fetters, many persons were oppressed, even before they had arrived at years of maturity.

Many persons likewise entered into such monastic life through ignorance, who, although they were not of years too immature, did not sufficiently consider and weigh their abilities. All these, thus involved and ensnared, are urged and forced to remain in such bonds, although even the Papal regulations would liberate many of them. And it was more oppressive in nunneries than in monasteries ; yet it would seem fit that females, as being weaker, should have been spared. This severity likewise met the displeasure of many pious persons in former times ; for they well knew that both boys and girls were often thrust into these monasteries merely for the purpose of being supported. They saw also how evil this course of procedure proved, what offences, what burdens of conscience it produced, and many people complained, that in a matter so perilous the canons were not regarded at all. Besides this, an extravagant opinion obtained concerning monastic vows, which was very prevalent, and which was displeasing even to many monks, who possessed some little reason.

For they allege, that monastic vows are equal to Baptism, and that by monastic life remission of sins and justification may be merited before God ; yea, they add still farther, that by monastic life, not only righteousness and holiness are merited, but also that by it the commands and counsels comprehended in the Gospel, are kept : and thus monastic vows were commended more highly than Baptism. Again, that men merit more by monastic life than by all other conditions which God has established : as that of pastor and minister, prince, ruler, and lord, and the like, all of whom according to the command,

word, and precept of God, serve in their vocations without pretensions of superior holiness. None of these things can be denied, for they are extant in their own books. Moreover, he that is thus ensnared and enters into a monastery, learns but little concerning Christ.

Formerly schools were kept in monasteries, for the purpose of teaching the holy Scriptures and other things which are useful to the Christian church, so that ministers and bishops could be selected from them. But now there is a different custom. For formerly they assembled in monasteries with a view to learn the Scripture, but now they falsely pretend that monastic life is of such a nature, that men merit the grace of God and holiness before God by it; yea, that it is a state of perfection, and they exalt it far above other states which God has instituted. We cite all these things, without detraction, in order that it may be the better understood and comprehended how, and what we preach and teach.

First, among us we teach concerning those who propose marriage, that all those who are not qualified for a single state, have a perfect right to marry. For vows cannot annul the order and command of God. Thus reads the command of God, 1 Cor. 7, 2: "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband." And not only the command of God, but also his creation and ordination, urge and enforce all those to a state of matrimony, who are not endowed with the gift of continence, by a special gift, agreeably to this declaration of God himself, Gen. 2, 18: "It is not good for man to be alone, I will make him an help meet for him."

Now, what can be alleged against this? They may applaud vows and duty as highly as they please, and adorn them as much as possible, yet it cannot be maintained that God's command can thus be annulled. The doctors say, that vows, even in opposition to the authority of the Pope, are not binding; how much less, then, should they bind, and have power and effect against the commands of God?

If the obligation of vows had no reason for their being annulled, the popes would not have granted dispensations against them; for it is not proper for any man to annul obligations which grow out of divine rights. Wherefore the popes have considered well, that in these obligations equity should be employed, and they have often granted dispensations, as with the king of Arragon, and many others. Now, if for the preservation of temporal things, dispensations have been granted, more justly should they be granted on account of the necessity of souls.

Secondly, why do the opposite party so strenuously insist that vows must be kept, and not first consider whether the vow is of a proper nature? For such vows as can be kept, should be made voluntarily, and without constraint. But it is well known how far human power and ability can maintain perpetual chastity. Nor are there many, either of males or of females, that have taken monastic vows of themselves, freely and with due consideration. Before they arrive at a proper understanding, they are persuaded to assume monastic vows. Sometimes they are also urged and forced to them. For this reason it is not just, to insist so obstinately and strenuously upon the obligation of vows, seeing that all must confess, that it is contrary to the nature and essential character of a vow, to make it unwillingly and without due counsel and consideration.

Some canons and Papal regulations rescind the vows which were made previous to the fifteenth year. For they maintain, that before that period no one has knowledge sufficient to enable him to determine upon the order and regulation of a whole life. Another canon allows a still greater number of years on account of human weakness. It forbids the taking of monastic vows under the eighteenth year. From this prohibition the greater part would have excuse and reason to withdraw from monasteries; for the greater part entered them before that age. Finally, if even the breaking of monastic vows might be censured, yet it could, however, not follow from this, that their marriages should be dissolved. For St. Augustine says, *27 Quæst., 1 Cap., Nuptiarum*, that "such marriages should not be dissolved." Now, St. Augustine stands in high repute in the Christian church, although some have since maintained otherwise.

Although the command of God concerning marriage, absolves very many from their monastic vows, yet our writers allege many other reasons, why monastic vows are void and ineffectual. For every species of worship, chosen and instituted by men, without the precept and command of God, in order to obtain righteousness and divine grace, is repugnant to him, and in opposition to his command and to the Gospel. As Christ himself says, Matt. 15, 9: "But in vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men." So St. Paul also teaches every where, that men should not seek righteousness from religious services devised by men, but that righteousness and holiness in the sight of God, come from the faith and confidence that God accepts us graciously for the sake of Christ his own Son. Now, it is clear, that the monks have taught and preached that their assumed piety atones for sin, and obtains righteousness and the grace of God. What else is this, but diminishing the

glory and honor of the grace of Christ, and denying the righteousness of faith? Wherefore it follows that the customary vows are a false and an absurd worship of God. For that reason they are also not binding. For an ungodly vow, and one contrary to the command of God, is void, and the canons teach also that an oath shall not be an obligation to sin.

St. Paul says, Gal. 5, 4: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." Therefore those also who wish to be justified by vows, are separated from Christ, and fail to obtain the grace of God. For these rob Christ of his honor, who alone justifies, and thus they bestow such honor on their vows and monastic life.

Nor can it be denied, that the monks have taught and preached that by their vows and monastic habits and conduct they are justified, and merit the forgiveness of sins; and, indeed, they have invented things still more absurd, and have asserted, that they impart their good works to others. Now, if some one would press the matter and bring all these charges in array against them, how many things could be collected, of which the monks themselves are now ashamed, and which they would disown! Besides these things they have also persuaded the people, that their self-devised religious orders constitute Christian perfection. This is, indeed, commending works as a source of justification. It is not a small offence in the Christian church, to appoint for the people a species of worship, which men have devised without the command of God, and to teach that such worship makes men pious and just before God. For the righteousness of faith, which should be chiefly inculcated in the church, becomes obscured, when the eyes of the people are blinded with this strange, angelic spirituality and false pretence of poverty, meekness, and chastity.

Moreover, by this means the commandments of God, and the proper and true service of God, are obscured, when the people hear that the monks alone are in a state of perfection. For Christian perfection consists in fearing God from the heart and with earnestness, and also in cherishing sincere reliance, faith, and trust, that for the sake of Christ we have a gracious and merciful God, that we may and should ask and desire of him what is necessary for us, and confidently expect help from him in every tribulation, according to our calling or station in life: that we also should in the meantime perform good works towards others with diligence, and attend to our occupations. In this consist true perfection and the proper service of God,—not in mendicancy, or in a black or gray

hood, &c. But the common people are led into many pernicious views by the false commendation of monastic life. If they hear a state of celibacy applauded beyond measure, it follows that they are pained with the sting of conscience in their matrimonial relations. For from this, if the common man hears that the mendicants alone are perfect, he is not able to perceive that he may possess property, and carry on an occupation, without sinning. If the populace hear that it is merely a recommendation not to exercise revenge, it follows that some will think it no sin to exercise private revenge. Others are of opinion that revenge does not at all become a Christian, not even the government. Many examples are on record, of persons who abandoned their wives and children and business, and shut themselves up in monasteries. This they said, was fleeing out of the world, and seeking a life more pleasing to God than their previous one. Nor were they able to understand, that men should serve God in those commandments which He has given, and not in the commandments devised by men. Now this is a good and perfect state of life, which is founded on the command of God, but that is a dangerous state of life, which is not founded on his command.

Concerning these things it was necessary to instruct the people properly. Gerson, in former times, has also censured the error of the monks, concerning perfection, and he intimates that in his day it was a new doctrine that monastic life should be a state of perfection. Many ungodly views and errors attach to monastic vows; as, that they justify and make holy in the sight of God; that they constitute Christian perfection; that by them both the counsels and commands of the Gospel are fulfilled; that they have a superabundance of works which men do not owe to God.

Since, then, all these things are false, vain, and fictitious, monastic vows are void and ineffectual.

ARTICLE XXVIII.—OF THE POWER OF THE BISHOPS OR CLERGY.

Concerning the power of bishops much has been written in former times, and some have improperly mingled together civil and ecclesiastical power. From this heterogeneous commixture extensive wars, rebellions, and insurrections have been produced, by the pontiffs having, under pretence of their power, given unto them by Christ, not only established new modes of worship, and oppressed the consciences of men with reservations of certain cases and with violent excommunications, but also presumed to dethrone kings and emperors at pleasure, and to place others in their stead. This presumption has

long since been censured by learned and pious men. Hence, those who think with us, for the purpose of consoling the consciences of men, have been compelled to point out the lines of distinction between civil and ecclesiastical power. And they have taught, that both civil and ecclesiastical power, on account of God's commandment, ought to be honored and sustained with all sincerity, as the two greatest blessings of God on earth.

Accordingly they teach, that the power of the keys or of the bishops, according to the Gospel, is a power and commission from God to preach the Gospel, to remit and to retain sins, and to attend to and administer the sacraments. For Christ sent forth the Apostles with the command: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you. Receive ye the Holy Ghost. Whosoever sins ye remit, they are remitted unto them; and whosoever sins ye retain, they are retained," John 20, 21-23. This power of the keys or of the bishops is to be exercised and carried into effect alone by the doctrine and preaching of the Word of God, and by the administration of the sacraments to many or to a few persons, according to the call. For by this means are conferred, not temporal, but eternal blessings and treasures; as, eternal righteousness, the Holy Spirit, and eternal life. These blessings cannot be obtained otherwise than by the office of the ministry, and by the administration of the holy sacraments. As St. Paul says, Rom. 1, 16: "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth." Inasmuch then as the power of the church or of the bishops confers eternal gifts, and is exercised and exerted only by the ministry, it cannot by any means interfere with civil polity and government. For the latter relates to matters entirely different from the Gospel, and protects with its power not the souls of men, but their bodies and possessions against external violence, by the sword and bodily penalties.

Therefore these two governments, the civil and ecclesiastical, ought not to be mingled and confounded. For the ecclesiastical power has its command to preach the Gospel and to administer the sacraments, and it ought not to interfere with a foreign office, it ought not to dethrone or make kings, it ought not to abolish or disturb civil laws and obedience to government, it ought not to make and appoint laws for civil power concerning political matters. As Christ himself also has said, John 18, 36: "My kingdom is not of this world." Again, Luke 12, 14: "Who made me a judge, or a divider over you?" And St. Paul says to the Philippians, 3, 20: "Our conversation is in heaven." And in 2 Cor. 10, 4: "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal, but mighty through God to

the pulling down of strong holds; casting down imaginations, and every high thing that exalteth itself against the knowledge of God."

In this manner we distinguish between the two powers, the civil and ecclesiastical, and recommend both of them to be held in honor as the highest gifts of God on earth. But if bishops have any civil power, they possess it not as bishops from divine right, but from human imperial right, conferred by emperors and kings, for the civil management of their own possessions, and it has nothing at all to do with the office of the Gospel. Wherefore the episcopal office, according to divine appointment, is to preach the Gospel, to remit sins, to judge of doctrine, to reject the doctrine which is contrary to the Gospel, and to exclude from the Christian community the wicked, whose impious conduct is manifest, without human power, but by the Word of God alone, and in that case the parishioners and churches are under obligation to be obedient to the bishops, agreeably to the declaration of Christ, Luke 10, 16: "He that heareth you, heareth me." But if they teach, appoint, or establish any thing contrary to the Gospel, we have the command of God in such case, not to be obedient, Matt. 7, 15: "Beware of false prophets." And St. Paul to the Gal. 1, 8: "Though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed." And in 2 Cor. 13, 8: "For we can do nothing against the truth, but for the truth." Again, verse 10: "According to the power which the Lord hath given me to edification, and not to destruction." Thus the ecclesiastical law commands in like manner, 2 *Quest.*, 7 *Cap. Sacerdotes*, and in *Cap. Oves*. And St. Augustine writes in the epistle against Petilian, that, "We should not obey those bishops who have been duly elected, if they commit errors, or teach or ordain any thing contrary to the divine Scripture."

But, since the bishops have other power and jurisdiction in certain matters, as those relating to marriage or tithes, they derive it from the power of human laws. But if the ordinaries are negligent in such office, the princes, whether they do it willingly or reluctantly, are under obligation in that case, for the sake of peace, to put into execution the law against their subjects, for the prevention of discord and confusion in the community.

Further, it is questionable, whether bishops have power also to establish in the church, ceremonies, such as ordinances concerning meats, holidays, and concerning different orders of ministers. Those who attribute this power to bishops, cite the declaration of Christ, John 16, 12, 13: "I have yet many things to say unto you, but ye

cannot bear them now. Howbeit, when he, the Spirit of truth is come, he will guide you into all truth." In addition they introduce the example, Acts 15, 20, where they have forbidden "things strangled and blood." So it is alleged also, that the Sabbath was changed into Sunday, contrary to the Ten Commandments, as they regard it, and no example is urged and alleged more strenuously, than the change of the Sabbath; and they wish to maintain by that, that the power of the church is great, since it has dispensed with a precept of the Ten Commandments, and has effected some change in them.

But relative to this question we teach, that the bishops have no power to appoint and establish any thing contrary to the Gospel, as has already been stated, and as the canons teach, *Dist.* 9. Now it is evidently contrary to the command and Word of God, to enact or enforce laws with a view to atone for sins and to merit grace by them; for if we presume to earn grace by such ordinances, it detracts from the merit and honor of Christ. It is also clear, that on account of this opinion human traditions innumerable have prevailed in Christendom, and by this means the doctrine of faith, and the righteousness of faith, were entirely suppressed—new holidays, new fasts were daily commanded, new ceremonies, and new honors to the saints were instituted, in order to merit grace and all blessings from God, by such works. Again, they who institute human traditions, act contrary to the command of God, by ascribing sins to meats, to days, and the like things, and by thus encumbering Christendom with the servitude of the law, as though there had to be among Christians, to merit the grace of God, such a divine service as the Levitical, and as if he had commanded the Apostles and bishops to establish it, as some writers testify. And there is no doubt, that some of the bishops have been deceived by the example of the law of Moses; hence originated those innumerable traditions: that it is a mortal sin to do any manner of work on holidays, even without offence to others; that it is a mortal sin to neglect the canonical hours; that certain meats pollute the conscience; that fasting is a work by which God may be reconciled; that sin in a case reserved, will not be forgiven, except the reserver of the case be first entreated; notwithstanding, the ecclesiastical laws do not speak of the reservation of sin, but of the reservation of church-penalty.

Whence, then, have the bishops power and authority to impose such traditions upon the Christian community to ensnare men's consciences? For St. Peter in the Acts of the Apostles, forbids the "yoke to be put upon the neck of the disciples," Acts 15, 10. And St. Paul says to the Corinthians: "That power was given to him

to edification, and not to destruction," 2 Cor. 13, 10. Why then do they multiply sins by such traditions? We have clear declarations from the divine writings, which forbid the establishment of such traditions, in order to merit the grace of God, or as if they were necessary to salvation. Thus says St. Paul, Col. 2, 16: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day, or of the new-moon, or of the Sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Again, verse 20: "Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ, from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, which say, (touch not; taste not; handle not; which all are to perish with the using;) after the commandments and doctrines of men? Which things have indeed a show of wisdom." Again, St. Paul to Titus, 1, 14, forbids publicly, the "giving heed to Jewish fables, and commandments of men that turn from the truth."

So also Christ himself speaks of those who urge the people to observe human commandments, Matt. 15, 14: "Let them alone, they be blind leaders of the blind;" and rejecting such service, he says: "Every plant which my heavenly Father hath not planted shall be rooted up," verse 13. Now, if the bishops have power to encumber the churches with innumerable traditions, and to ensnare men's consciences, why then does the holy Scripture so often forbid the making and observing of human traditions? Why does it style them the doctrines of devils? Shall the Holy Ghost have warned us against all these things in vain?

Wherefore, since such ordinances, instituted as necessary in order to reconcile God and to merit grace, are in opposition to the Gospel, it is by no means suitable for the bishops to enforce such services. For the doctrine of Christian liberty must be retained in the church, namely, that the servitude of the law is not necessary to justification, as St. Paul writes to the Galatians: "Stand fast therefore in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage," Gal. 5, 1. For the chief article of the Gospel, that without our merit we obtain the grace of God through faith in Christ, must be maintained, and that we do not merit it in consequence of rites instituted by men.

What, then, should be held concerning Sunday and other similar church ordinances and ceremonies? To this we make the following reply:—That the bishops or pastors may make regulations, so that things may be carried on orderly in the church,—not to obtain the grace of God, nor yet to atone for sins, or to bind the consciences of

men to hold these regulations as necessary services of God, and to regard them, as if those commit sin, who break them without offence to others. Thus St. Paul to the Corinthians ordains, that the women in the congregation should cover their heads, 1 Cor. 11, 5. Again, that the preachers should speak in the congregation, not all at the same time, but in order, one after another.

It is proper for a Christian congregation to observe such regulations for the sake of peace and love, and in such cases to be obedient to the bishops and pastors, and to observe these regulations so far as that one offend not another, that there may be no disorder or unseemly conduct in the church; yet that the consciences of men be not encumbered with the idea that these observances are held as necessary to salvation, and that those commit sin, who violate them even without offence to others: as, no one says that a woman commits sin in going abroad bareheaded, unless thereby she offend the people. In like manner such is the case with the institution of Sunday, of Easter, of Pentecost, and the like holidays and rites. Those, then, who are of opinion, that such institution of Sunday instead of the Sabbath, was established as a thing necessary, err very much. For the holy Scripture has abolished the Sabbath, and it teaches that all ceremonies of the old law, since the revelation of the Gospel, may be discontinued. And yet as it was necessary to appoint a certain day, so that the people might know when they should assemble, the Christian church ordained Sunday for that purpose, and possessed rather more inclination and willingness for this alteration, in order that the people might have an example of Christian liberty, that they might know that neither the observance of the Sabbath, nor of any other day, is indispensable.

There are many unwarrantable disputations relative to the change of the Law, to the ceremonies of the New Testament, to the alteration of the Sabbath; all of which have sprung from the false and erroneous opinion, that there must be in the Christian church a divine service corresponding with the Levitical or Jewish service of God, and that Christ had commanded the Apostles and bishops to devise new ceremonies, which should be necessary to salvation. These errors obtained in Christendom when the righteousness of faith was not clearly and purely taught and preached. Some also argue, that Sunday must be kept, although not from divine authority, prescribing in what form and to what degree labor may be performed on that day. But what else are such disputations, but snares of conscience? For although they presume to modify and mitigate human traditions, yet no *exemption* or mitigation can be at-

Voltaire - Grotius -

tained, so long as the opinion exists and continues, that they are necessary. Now this opinion must continue, if men know nothing of the righteousness of faith, and of Christian liberty. The Apostles have given the command, *to abstain from blood and things strangled*. But who observes this now? Yet those do not sin who do not observe it, because even the Apostles themselves did not wish to burden the conscience with such servitude, but they prohibited it for a time to avoid offence. For we must have regard, in view of this ordinance, to the chief article of the Christian doctrine, which is not abrogated by this decree.

Scarcely any of the ancient canons are observed agreeably to their purport, and many of these ordinances are going out of use daily, even among those who maintain such traditions with the greatest zeal. It would afford no counsel or relief to the conscience, were this modification not observed,—namely, to know, in preserving these traditions, that they are not preserved as being necessary, and that it would not be injurious to the conscience, even if these traditions should cease. But the bishops might easily preserve obedience, if they would not urge the keeping of those traditions which cannot be observed without sin. Now, they forbid the administration of both elements in the Eucharist; they forbid the priests to marry; and receive no one, unless he has first taken an oath not to preach this doctrine, though it is without doubt in accordance with the holy Gospel.

Our churches do not desire the bishops to make peace and union at the expense of their honor and dignity, (though this would be proper for the bishops to do in case of necessity,) but they entreat only, that the bishops discontinue certain unjust burdens which did not exist in the church formerly, and which are contrary to the custom of the universal Christian church. There might, perhaps, have been some reasons for these, when they were first established, but they are not suitable for our times. It is likewise undeniable, that some ordinances were received through ignorance. Wherefore the bishops ought to have the kindness to mitigate these ordinances, since such change would not be injurious to the preservation of the unity of the Christian church; for many ordinances instituted by men, have ceased of themselves in the course of time, and were unnecessary to be observed, as the Papal laws themselves testify. But if it cannot be granted by them, or obtained from them, that these human ordinances may be moderated and abolished, which cannot be observed without sin, we must follow the rule of the Apostles, which commands that “we ought to obey God rather than men,” Acts 5, 29.

St. Peter, 1 Pet. 5, 3, forbids the bishops to rule as if they had power to force the churches into whatever measure they please. Now, it is not our design to deprive the bishops of their power, but we desire and entreat, that they would not force the consciences of men to sin. If however they will not desist, but condemn this entreaty, they may consider that they will, therefore, be under obligation to render an account unto God, since by this obstinacy of theirs, they give occasion for disunion and schisms which they ought properly to assist in preventing.

CONCLUSION.

These are the principal Articles which are regarded as controverted. It were easy indeed to enumerate many more abuses and errors, but in order to be brief, and to prevent prolixity, we have mentioned only the principal ones, from which the others may easily be perceived. For in former times much complaint existed concerning indulgences, pilgrimages, and the abuse of excommunication. The clergy have also had endless disputes with the monks about hearing confessions, about burials, funeral sermons, and numberless other subjects. All such we have thought proper to pass over gently, so that the more important subjects in this matter, might be the better understood. Nor should it be imagined, that any thing has been said or intimated here against any one out of hatred or disrespect; but we have stated these subjects only, which we have considered as necessary to refer to and to mention, in order that it might be the more clearly perceived, that by us nothing is received either in doctrine or ceremonies, which might be contrary to the holy Scripture, or opposed to the universal Christian church. For it is clear, indeed, and evident, that with the greatest vigilance, by the help of God, (without boasting) we have been careful that no new and ungodly doctrine insinuate itself, spread, and prevail in our churches.

The foregoing Articles we have, in conformity with the Edict, desired to submit, as an evidence of our Confession and of our doctrine. And if any one should be found who has any objection to them, we are ready to give him further information with reasons from Holy Writ.

Your Imperial Majesty's most humble subjects :

JOHN, Elector of Saxony.

GEORGE, Margrave of Brandenburg.

ERNEST, Duke of Luneburg.

PHILIP, Landgrave of Hesse.

[JOHN FREDERICK, Duke of Saxony.

FRANCIS, Duke of Luneburg.]

WOLFGANG, Prince of Anhalt.

THE IMPERIAL CITY of Nuremberg.

THE IMPERIAL CITY of Reutlingen.

APOLOGY
OF
THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

APOLOGY OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

PREFACE.

PHILIP MELANCHTHON TO THE READER:

After the Confession of our Princes had been publicly read, several theologians and monks prepared a Confutation of our Confession, to which his Imperial Majesty, after having had it read at a session of the Princes, required *our* Princes to give their assent. But our representatives, having heard, that many articles were disapproved, which they could not reject without a violation of conscience, desired a copy of the Confutation to be shown them, in order that they might see, what the opposition condemned, and be able to refute their arguments. And in a cause like this, relating to religion and the instruction of conscience, they supposed that their adversaries would not be disposed to withhold their manuscript. But this our Princes were not able to obtain, except upon the most dangerous terms, which they could not accept. A reconciliation, however, was afterwards attempted, when it appeared that our Princes declined no proposition however burdensome, with which they could comply without a violation of conscience. But our adversaries pertinaciously demanded, that we should approve certain manifest abuses and errors; and as we could not do this, his Imperial Majesty again demanded that our Princes should give their assent to the Confutation. This they refused to do. For how could they agree to a treatise on the subject of religion, which they had never seen! especially since they had heard, that some articles were condemned, in which they could not, without conscious guilt, coincide with the decisions of their adversaries. They directed me, however, and some others, to prepare an Apology of our Confession, in which it should be explained to his Imperial Majesty, why we could not receive the Confutation, and in which the objections of our adversaries should be invalidated. For some of us had heard the general heads and points of argument while the Confutation was being read. This Apology they finally submitted to his Imperial Majesty, in order that he might know, that we were prevented by very great and weighty reasons, from approving the Confutation. His Majesty, however, would not receive the offered manuscript. Afterwards a certain edict was published, in which our adversaries boasted, that they had confuted our Confession from the Scriptures.

Accordingly, my reader, you now have our Apology, from which you will learn, not only what decisions our adversaries have made,—for we have related them in good faith,—but you will perceive also that they have condemned several articles contrary to the plain declarations of the Holy Spirit, and how far they have been from shaking our convictions by the evidences of Scripture. But although we commenced the Apology, by conferring with

others, yet during its preparation I have added some things. For this reason I have prefixed my name, that no one may complain that the book has been published without a definite author. It has always been my custom in these controversies, to the utmost of my ability, to retain the form of the usual doctrine, that harmony might at some time be the more easily re-established. Nor would I now pursue a much different course, though I might with propriety draw the men of this age farther from the opinions of our adversaries. But the adversaries are so conducting the dispute, as to show, that they are not in search either of truth or harmony, but thirsting for our blood.

And now having written in a spirit as moderate as possible, if any thing be said here which may seem too harsh, I must premise that I am contending, not with the Emperor or the Princes, whom I reverence as I ought, but with the theologians and the monks, who have written the *Confutation*. I have but recently seen the *Confutation*, and observed, that it is written in a spirit so insidious and vituperative, that in some places it might deceive even the vigilant. I have not noticed, however, all their sophistry; for the task would be endless;—but have taken up the principal arguments, for the purpose of leaving our testimony among all nations, that we have maintained correct and pious views in reference to the Gospel of Christ. Discord is by no means agreeable to us, nor are we insensible of our own danger, for we can easily conceive the bitterness of the hatred with which we see our adversaries inflamed. But we cannot reject the plain truth, indispensable as it is to the church; for we believe, that every difficulty and every danger should be endured, for the glory of Christ and the advancement of the church. We are confident that God will approve our obedience, and we expect for ourselves the more equitable decisions of posterity. For it cannot be denied, that many points of Christian doctrine, which it is essential to keep apparent before the church, have been brought to light and explained by our adherents. We do not feel disposed here to state, under what pernicious and most dangerous opinions they had once lain buried among the monks, canonists, theologians, and sophists. We have the public testimonials of many good men, who render thanks to God for the inestimable blessing of being taught better things on many essential points, than our adversaries generally maintain. We therefore recommend our cause to Christ, who will finally decide these controversies, and we entreat him to regard his wasted and afflicted churches, and restore them to pious and perpetual harmony.

APOLOGY OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

ART. I.—OF GOD.

The adversaries approve of the first article of our Confession, in which it is declared that we believe and teach, that there is one eternal, individual, undivided, Divine Essence, and yet, that there are three distinct persons in this divine essence, (or being,) equally powerful, equally eternal, God the Father, God the Son, and God the Holy Ghost. This article we have ever thus taught and defended in its purity, and we maintain and feel certain, that it has a foundation in the holy Scriptures, so firm, good, and sure, that no one can object to or overthrow it.

Wherefore we conclude without hesitation, that all those who hold or teach otherwise, are idolaters and blasphemers, and aliens from the church of Christ.

ART. II. (1.)—OF ORIGINAL SIN.

Nor do the adversaries object to the second article, concerning original sin; yet they censure our definition, in which we assert what original sin is; though we merely spoke of it incidentally in that place.

Immediately in the outset your Imperial Majesty will perceive, that our opponents, while they frequently do not comprehend or understand any thing relative to this all important subject, they often maliciously and intentionally pervert our words, or misconstrue our meaning. For although we have stated in the most simple and clear manner, what original sin is, or is not, yet they have out of malice and ill-will, intentionally, given an improper construction to the plainest and most simple language.

For thus they say: "You declare original sin to be this, that we are born with a mind and heart in which there is no fear of God, or confidence in him,—but this is actual guilt, and an act itself, or *actualis culpa*; therefore it is not original sin." It is by no means difficult to perceive and to judge, that such cavilling proceeds from the theologians, and not from the counsels of the Emperor. Now although we are able very easily to confute these envious, dangerous, and wanton constructions; yet, in order that all upright and honorable men may understand that we teach nothing improper in this respect, we request them to examine our former German Confession, presented at Augsburg: this will sufficiently prove, that we teach

nothing new or unheard of. For thus it is written in that Confession:—* *Weiter wird gelehret, dass nach dem Fall Adä alle Menschen, so natürlich geboren werden, in Sünden empfangen und geboren werden; das ist, dass sie alle von Mutterleibe an, voll böser Lust und Neigung sind, keine wahre Gottesfurcht, keinen wahren Glauben an Gott von Natur haben können.*

From this it is evident, that we maintain, with respect to all that are born of flesh, that they are unfit for all things pertaining to God, do not sincerely fear him, and cannot either believe or trust in him. We here speak of the inborn evil character of the heart, not only of actual guilt, or of real crimes and sins; for we say, that in all the children of Adam there are evil inclinations and desires, and that it is not in the power of any one to prepare his heart of himself, to know God, or sincerely to confide in, or fear Him.

We are, however, desirous of hearing what can be censured here. For pious and upright men who love truth, perceive, without any doubt, that this is correct and true. In this sense we say in our Latin Confession, that in natural man there is not *potentia*; that is, not sufficient virtue, or ability, even in innocent children, who are also incapable from Adam, ever to fear and love God sincerely. But in adults or grown persons, there are acts and actual sins, besides the innate evil disposition of the heart.

Hence, when we speak of innate evil desires, we mean not only the acts, the evil works, or fruits, but the evil inclinations within, which continue, so long as we are not born anew through the Spirit and faith. But we shall hereafter show more fully, that we have described original depravity, namely, what it is and is not, according to the ancient and usual manner of the scholastics, and that we have employed no unusual terms. I must however first show why I have preferred these terms, and not others, particularly in this place.

Thus our adversaries themselves speak upon this subject in their schools, and acknowledge that evil desires constitute the material or *materiale* as they term it, of original sin. Wherefore, as I wished to define what original sin is, I could not pass over this, especially at this time, when some speak of these innate evil desires more like heathens, according to philosophy, than to the divine Word or holy Scriptures. For some declare, that original sin in human nature is not an innate corruption, but merely a defect and an imposed charge or burden, which all the descendants of Adam must bear on account of *his* sins, (not their own,) and that therefore all are mortal, but

* For a translation of these words, see Article II. of the Augsburg Confession.

did not themselves by nature, and from their mothers' womb, inherit sin.

They say, moreover, that no one is condemned eternally on account of original sin or depravity alone; but precisely as bondmen and bondservants are born of a bondmaid, not on account of any fault in themselves, but because they must endure and bear the misfortunes and misery of their mother, though born as other men without blemish; in like manner original sin is not an inborn evil or sin, but merely a defect, an incumbrance which has come upon us from Adam, but of ourselves we are not involved in sin and inherited wrath.

In order, then, to show that a doctrine so unchristian did not meet our approbation, I have employed these words:—*All men from their mothers' womb are full of evil desires and inclinations*; and therefore I also call original sin a disease, for the purpose of showing that not a *part* merely, but the *whole* man with his whole nature, is born in sin, with a hereditary constitutional disease. Hence we denominate it not merely an evil desire, but also maintain, that all men are born in sin, without fear of God and without faith. Nor do we add this without cause. The scholastics treat of original sin, as if it were but a trivial, slight defect, and do not understand what original depravity is, or in what light the holy Fathers (ecclesiastical writers) considered it.

When the sophists endeavor to define what original sin is, what the *fomes* or evil propensity is, they say, among other things, in their usual superficial manner, that it is a defect in the body, and propound the questions, “Whether this defect was first communicated to Adam by poison from the forbidden fruit in Paradise, or by the afflation of the serpent?” Again, “Whether the medicine continues to aggravate the disease?” With such litigious questions they have quite confounded and suppressed the principal point, and the most important question as to what original sin is.

Therefore, in speaking of original sin, they omit the most essential and necessary part, and take no notice at all of our real and principal misery, namely, that we human beings are all born with such a nature, that we neither know, see, nor observe God or his works, that we despise him, that we do not fear and trust in him sincerely, and that we hate his judgments. Again, that all of us by nature flee from God, as from a tyrant, and are displeased with, and murmur against his will; and that we do not confide in, or venture any thing upon, the goodness of God, but ever rely more upon our wealth, our property, our friends. This active hereditary contagion, by which our whole nature is corrupted, by which we all inherit such

hearts, minds, and thoughts from Adam, as are immediately opposed to God and to his first and greatest commandment, the scholastics pass over in silence.

They speak of this subject, as if human nature were uncorrupted and capable of greatly reverencing God, of loving him above all things, of keeping his commandments, &c., and do not see that they contradict themselves. For if we were able by our own strength to do these things, namely, to reverence God highly, to love him sincerely, to keep his commandments, what would this differ from being a new creature in Paradise, entirely pure and holy? Now if we are capable, by our own strength, of accomplishing so great a thing as to love God above all things, to keep his commandments, as the scholastics boldly assert, what then is original depravity? And if, by our own power, we can become righteous, then is the grace of Christ unnecessary. What need would we have of the Holy Spirit, if we, by human ability, could love God above all things, and keep his commandments?

Here we can all perceive, how absurdly our adversaries speak of this important subject. They acknowledge the minor defects of our sinful nature, but take no notice of the very greatest hereditary misery and wretchedness, of which all the Apostles complain, of which the holy Scriptures every where speak, and all the Prophets exclaim, as the 14th Psalm and several others say: "There is none that is just, no not one; there are none who seek after God; there is none that doeth good, no, not one;" Psalm 5, 9: "Their throat is an open sepulchre; they flatter with their tongues; the fear of God is not before their eyes." And certainly the holy Scriptures show plainly that all this has not suddenly flown upon us, but is inherent in us from our birth.

But while the scholastics mingle much philosophy with Christian doctrine, and have much to say about the light of reason and the *actibus elicitis*, (self-elected acts,) they make too much of freewill and our own works. Upon this subject they taught, that men become just before God, by a life externally honest; and did not perceive the innate impurity within the heart, which no one discovers, except through the Word of God alone, which the scholastics very sparingly and rarely employ in their books. We also say that it is to some extent within our power to lead a life externally honest; but not to become just and holy in the sight of God.

These are the reasons, why, in defining original sin, I made mention of innate evil lust, and stated, that by his own natural powers no man is able to fear God, or to trust in him. For I desired to

show, that original sin also includes this evil, namely, that no man knows or reverences God, that none can sincerely fear, love, and trust in him. These are the chief characteristics of this hereditary contagion, by which through Adam we are all directly opposed to God, to the first table of Moses, and to the greatest and highest divine commandment.

And we have here taught nothing new. The old scholastics, if we understand them correctly, have said precisely the same thing. For they say, that original sin is the *want of the original purity and righteousness of Paradise*. But what is *justitia originalis*, or original righteousness in Paradise? Righteousness and holiness in the Scriptures, always imply, that we are not only to observe the second table of the Decalogue, to do good works, and to serve our neighbor; but the Scriptures call him pious, holy, and righteous, who keeps and observes the first table—the first commandment—that is, who sincerely fears and loves God, and trusts in him.

Therefore, the purity and incorruptness of Adam did not consist only of perfect physical health and purity of blood, or of unimpaired powers of the body, as they say, but the greatest excellency of this noble first creature was a bright light in the heart to know God and his works, true fear of God, truly sincere confidence in him, and in all respects a correct, reliable understanding, and a heart well disposed towards God and all divine things.

This the holy Scriptures also testify, when they say, that man was created after God's own image and likeness, Gen. 1, 27. For what else is this, but that the divine wisdom and righteousness, which are of God, were formed in man, through which we know God, through which the brightness of God was reflected in us; that is, that these gifts, namely, a true, clear knowledge of God, true fear of and confidence in him, etc., were given to man when he was first created?

For thus Irenæus and Ambrose also interpret the image and similitude of God, when, in speaking at large upon this subject, they say among other things: "The soul in which God is not always, is not formed after his image." And Paul in his epistles to the Ephesians and Collossians, sufficiently shows, that nothing but the knowledge of God, and true integrity and righteousness before him, is meant in the Scriptures by the image of God.

And Longobard says distinctly, that "The righteousness first created in Adam, is the image and likeness of God, which he formed in man." I recite the opinions and declarations of the ancients, which create no difficulty in the interpretation of Augustine respecting the image

of God. Wherefore, when they say what original sin is, and declare, that it is the want of the original righteousness of man, they mean that man is corrupted not only in his body, or in the lower and less important faculties; but that he has also lost by it those higher gifts, namely, true knowledge of God, true love and confidence in him, and the power,—the light in his heart,—which creates in him love and desire for all this. For the *scholastici* or theologians themselves teach in the schools, that the acquisition of this same inborn righteousness would have been impossible for us, without special gifts and the aid of grace.

In order to be plainly understood, we call these *gifts*, namely, fear of God, knowledge of and confidence in him. From all this it clearly appears, that in defining what original sin is, the ancients coincide with us precisely; and that it is their opinion, that by it we have been brought into misery, are born without a good heart that truly loves God, and are unable to perform any pure or good work of ourselves.

Precisely the same opinion is also expressed by Augustine, when he states what original sin is, which he usually calls an evil lust; for he designs to show, that since the fall of Adam, instead of righteousness, evil desires are innate in us. For, as by nature we are born in sin, not fearing or loving God, nor trusting in him, we do nothing, since the fall, but trust in ourselves, despise God, or flee from him in terror.

Hence the words of Augustine also embrace the meaning of those who say, that original sin is the want of original righteousness; that is, evil lust, which, instead of this righteousness, adheres to us. And this evil lust is not merely a corruption or disorganization of the original perfect physical health of Adam in Paradise, but also an evil propensity and inclination, through which, in our very best and highest powers and in the light of our reason, we are nevertheless carnally minded and alienated from God. Nor do those know what they say, who teach, that man is enabled by his own strength to love God above all things, and who must at the same time acknowledge, that so long as this life continues, evil lust still remains, so far as it is not entirely mortified by the Holy Ghost.

We have, therefore, been thus particular in our description of original sin, in describing and expressing, both the evil lust and the want of original righteousness in Paradise; and we add, that this want is found in the descendants of Adam not trusting sincerely in God, nor fearing and loving him: and that the evil lust is our natural opposition to the Word of God with our whole mind, heart, and disposition, not only seeking all kinds of sensual enjoyments, and

trusting in our own wisdom and righteousness, but entirely forgetting God, and feeling for him but little, yea, no reverence at all. Not only the ancient Fathers, such as Augustine and others, but even the latest intelligent teachers and scholastics maintain, that these two conditions together constitute original sin, namely, the want of righteousness, and evil lust. For thus St. Thomas says, that "*Original sin is not only a want of original righteousness, but also an inordinate desire or lust in the soul. Therefore it is,*" continues he, "*not a mere want, but also aliquid positivum.*"* And Boneventura says plainly: "If it be asked, what original sin is, the right answer is: unrestrained evil lust. It may also correctly be answered, that it is a want of righteousness,"—the one including the other.

Hugo also intends the very same thing, when he says, that "Original sin is blindness in the mind, and evil lust in the flesh." Here he wishes to show, that we descendants of Adam are all so born as not to know God, that we despise him and do not trust in him, yea, that we flee from, and hate him. Hugo desired to comprise this briefly in the words, "*ignorantia in mente,*" blindness or ignorance in the mind. Besides, the declarations of the latest teachers also harmonize with the holy Scriptures. For Paul sometimes clearly calls original sin a want of *divine light*, &c.,—as in 1 Cor. 2, 14: "But the natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;" and in other places he calls it evil lust, as in Rom. 7, 5, 23, where he says: "But I see another law in my members," &c. This evil lust bringeth forth all kinds of evil fruit.

I could here adduce many more passages from the Scriptures, upon these two points, but in a case of truth so evident I deem it unnecessary. The intelligent will readily perceive, that, to be without the fear of God, and to have no confidence in him in our hearts, are not only *actus*, or actual sin, but an innate want or destitution of divine light and of every thing good—continuing so long as we are not born anew of the Holy Ghost and enlightened by him.

What we have hitherto written and taught in regard to original sin, is not new, or adverse to the teachings of the holy Scriptures and of the universal, holy Christian church; but we are bringing to light again, the necessary, strong, and clear passages of the holy Scriptures and of the Fathers, which were suppressed by the awkward disputes of the sophists; and we earnestly desire to restore Christian doctrine to its purity. For it is evident that the sophists and scho-

* Not the mere absence of original righteousness, but a real, positive, existing evil, a corrupt habit.—*Detzer.*

lastics did not understand what the Fathers meant by the words, "want or destitution of original righteousness."

It is, however, very necessary to treat properly and correctly of this subject, and to define what original sin is; for no one can sincerely long for or desire Christ, and the inestimable treasures of divine grace and favor, of which the Gospel speaks, without knowing and acknowledging his wretchedness and disease; as Christ says, Matt. 9, 12,—Mark 2, 17: "They that be whole need not a physician." All holy, honorable life or conduct, all the good works ever performed by man on earth, are mere hypocrisy and abomination before God, unless we first perceive and acknowledge, that we are miserable sinners by nature, obnoxious to the displeasure of God, and neither fear nor love him. Thus says the Prophet, Jer. 31, 19: "After that I was instructed, I smote upon my thigh;" and Psalm 116, 11: "All men are liars;" that is, they are not rightly disposed towards God.

Here our adversaries violently decry Dr. Luther, because he wrote, that *original sin remains even after baptism*; and they add, that this article was justly condemned by Leo X.

But here your Imperial Majesty will clearly perceive, that they treat us with the greatest injustice. Because our adversaries understand very well, in what sense Dr. Luther says: *original sin remains after baptism*. For he has ever clearly taught, that holy Baptism extirpates and removes the entire guilt and hereditary debt (*Erbpflicht*) of original sin; although the material (as they call it) of the sin, namely, the evil propensity and lust, remains.

Besides, in all his writings respecting this *material*, he adds, that the Holy Ghost, given through Baptism, begins daily to mortify and blot out the remaining evil desires in us, and puts into the heart a new light, a new mind and spirit. In the same sense Augustine also says: "Original sin is forgiven in Baptism, not that it becomes extinct, but it is not imputed."

Here Augustine openly acknowledges, that this sin remains in us, although it is not imputed unto us. And this passage of Augustine afterwards so fully received the approbation of the teachers, as to be cited in the decrees. And in opposition to Julian, Augustine says: "The law, which is in our members, is put away by spiritual regeneration; and yet remains in the flesh, which is mortal. It is put away, for the guilt is entirely remitted through the sacrament, by which the believers are born anew; and yet it remains—for it produces evil desires, against which the believer strives."

Our adversaries know full well, that Dr. Luther thus believes and

teaches; and as they cannot assail the doctrine itself, but must acknowledge its truth, they maliciously pervert his words, and misinterpret his meaning, in order to suppress the truth and to condemn it without a cause.

The adversaries, moreover, deny that evil lust is a burden, and a penalty inflicted upon us, and contend, that it is not a sin which merits death and condemnation. On the contrary, Dr. Luther says, that it is such. I have stated above, that Augustine also speaks to the same intent, that original sin is innate evil lust. If this be an error, they may settle the point with Augustine.

Besides Paul says, Rom. 7, 7, 8: "I had not known sin but by the law: for I had not known lust, except the law had said, Thou shalt not covet." Here Paul plainly declares, that he did not know that lust is sin, &c. Again, Rom. 7, 23: "I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members."

These are the indisputable and clear declarations of Paul, against which no gloss, no artful contrivance can avail,—and which no devils, nor men can overturn. Here he clearly calls evil lust, sin; nevertheless, he says, that this sin is not imputed unto those who believe in Christ.—Yet in itself, it really is a sin, deserving death and eternal condemnation. And there is no doubt, that this was the opinion of the ancient Fathers also. For Augustine disputed with, and contended earnestly against those who maintained, that the evil propensity and lust in man are not sin, are neither good nor bad, any more than having a black or white body.

And if the adversaries contend, that the *fomes*, or evil inclinations are neither good nor bad, they do it in opposition not only to many passages in the Scriptures, but also to the whole church and all the Fathers. For every experienced Christian knows and feels, alas, that these evils,—namely, that we esteem gold, property, and all other things more highly than God, and pass on through life in imagined security,—are in us and born with us. They also know, that according to the nature of sensual security, we are always inclined to think, that God's wrath and severity regarding sin, are not so great, as they really are; again, that we do not sincerely esteem the noble, inestimable treasures of the Gospel and the reconciliation of Christ according to their true value and excellency; that we murmur against the acts and will of God, when he does not immediately help us in afflictions, and comply with our desires; and finally, that we daily experience a feeling of dissatisfaction with the prosperity of

the ungodly in this world,—a feeling which David also, and all the saints lamented in themselves.

Besides, all men know, how easily their hearts are inflamed,—now with ambition,—now with anger and hatred,—and again, with impurity and unchastity.

Now if our adversaries themselves must acknowledge that such infidelity, such disobedience to God, is in the human heart, even if there be no entire consent, (as they say,) but only an inclination and a desire there, who will have the boldness to assert, that these gross propensities are neither good nor bad? For the Psalmist and Prophets, in the clearest terms, confess that they experienced these feelings.

But the sophists in the schools have treated this subject contrary to the clear, evident meaning of the Scriptures, and devised dreams and sayings taken from systems of philosophy, declaring, that we are neither good nor bad—blamable or praiseworthy on account of these evil desires. Again they say, that the evil desires and thoughts in our hearts are not sins, if we do not fully consent to them. This language in the books of the philosophers is applicable to external honesty before the world, and to external punishment before the world. For there it is true, as the jurists say, *L. Cogitationis*, thoughts are free, and exempt from punishment. But God searches into the heart; *his* judgments and *his* decisions are different.

In the same manner, they have also connected other absurd sayings with this subject, namely: God's creatures, and nature itself, cannot be intrinsically bad. To this assertion I do not object, when used where it is applicable. But it must not be employed to under-rate the sin of original depravity. These sayings of the sophists have done unspeakable injury, by mingling with the Gospel, the philosophy and doctrines, which relate to our external conduct before the world. They have taught these things not only in their schools, but without shame have preached them publicly before the people. And these ungodly, false, dangerous, and injurious doctrines had prevailed throughout the world: every where nothing was preached, but our own merit, and thus the knowledge of Christ and the Gospel were entirely suppressed.

Dr. Luther therefore desired to teach and explain from the Scriptures, how deadly a crime original sin is before God, and what great misery we are born in; and that original sin as it remains after Baptism is, in itself, not indifferent, but that we need Christ the Mediator, in order that God may not impute it unto us, and the constant light and operation of the Holy Spirit, to mortify and remove it.

Now although the sophists and scholastics teach otherwise, and teach contrary to the Scriptures, both concerning original sin and its penalty, when they say, that by his own powers man is able to keep the commandments of God; yet the penalty, imposed by God, upon the children of Adam, on account of original sin, is described in a very different manner in Genesis. For *there* human nature is not only doomed to death and other physical evils, but also subjected to the dominion of the devil. There the dreadful sentence is passed: "I will put enmity between thee and the woman, and between thy seed and her seed:" &c. Gen. 3, 15.

Evil lust and the want of original righteousness, are sin and punishment. But death and other physical ills, the tyranny and dominion of the devil, are properly, the punishments (*pœnæ*) of original sin. For by original sin, human nature is given into the power of the devil, and is thus brought captive under his dominion; who confounds and misleads many great and wise men in this world, with horrible errors, heresies and other blindness, and impels man into all kinds of other vices.

Now as it is impossible, to overcome this subtle and powerful spirit, Satan, without the aid of Christ, we cannot by our own strength, release ourselves from this imprisonment.

All history, from the beginning of the world teaches, what an unspeakably great power the kingdom of the devil is. We see, that from the highest to the lowest, the world is full of blasphemy, gross errors, and impious doctrines against God and his Word. In these strong chains and fetters, the devil holds in miserable captivity many wise people, many hypocrites, who appear holy before the world. The rest he leads into other gross vices, avarice, pride, &c.

Now, since Christ has been given unto us, to take away these sins and their heavy punishment, and for our benefit to overcome sin, death, and the kingdom of the devil, no one can sincerely rejoice in this great treasure, no one can understand the abundant riches of grace, till he feels the burden of our great inborn misery and wretchedness. Therefore our preachers dwelt upon this important point with the greatest diligence, and have taught nothing new, but simply, the plain words of the holy Scriptures, and the undeniable maxims of the Fathers,—Augustine and others.

This, we think, ought to satisfy your Imperial Majesty, in regard to the wicked, puerile, and unfounded assertions of our adversaries; with which they assail our article unjustly and without cause. Let them continue cavilling as much and as long as they please, we know for a certainty, that we teach correct Christian doctrine, and coin-

cide with the universal Christian church. If they introduce further wanton contentions, they will find, that men shall not be wanting here who, if it be the will of God, will reply to them and maintain the truth.

Our adversaries, for the most part, do not know what they maintain. How often do they speak and write contradictory to themselves? They do not understand even their own dialectics, (*dialectica*;) concerning the formal feature of original sin, that is, what original sin properly is in its essence; nor what the want of original righteousness is. We do not, however, propose, here to speak more in detail of their quarrelsome disputations, but merely to recite, in clear, common, and intelligible language, the sayings and opinions of the holy Fathers, whose doctrines we also teach.

ART. III.—OF CHRIST.

Our adversaries agree to the third article, in which we confess that in Christ there are two natures; namely, that the Son of God assumed human nature, and thus God and man are one person, one Christ; and that this Christ suffered and died for us, to reconcile us unto the Father; that he arose from the dead, possesses an eternal kingdom, justifies and sanctifies all believers, &c., as is taught in the Apostolic Creed and the Symbol of Nice.

ART. IV. (II.)—OF JUSTIFICATION.

The adversaries condemn the doctrine taught in the fourth, fifth, sixth, and twentieth articles of our Confession, that believers obtain the remission of their sins through Christ, by faith alone, without any merit of their own; and insolently reject these two tenets: first, that we deny that man can obtain remission of his sins through his own merit; and secondly, that we hold, teach, and confess that no one is reconciled to God, or obtains remission of his sins, but through faith in Christ alone.

Now, since this controversy concerns the principal and most important article of the whole Christian doctrine, and as much indeed depends upon this article, which contributes especially to a clear, correct apprehension of all the holy Scriptures, and which alone shows the way to the unspeakable treasure and the true knowledge of Christ; yea, which is the only key to the whole Bible, and without which the poor conscience can have no true, invariable, fixed hope, nor

conceive the riches of the grace of Christ;—we therefore pray your Imperial Majesty, graciously to hear us concerning these great, momentous, and all-important subjects, as the nature of the case demands. For, as our adversaries do not understand or know, what is meant in the Scriptures by remission of sin, by faith, grace and righteousness, they have miserably defiled this noble, indispensable, and leading article, without which no one can know Christ; they have entirely suppressed the invaluable treasure of the knowledge of Christ, of his kingdom, and of his grace; and robbed our poor consciences of this noble and great treasure and of this eternal comfort, so valuable and important to them.

But in order to confirm our Confession, and to refute what our adversaries have adduced, we shall, in the first place, show the foundation and reasons upon which both doctrines rest, so that each may be the more clearly understood.

All the Scriptures, both of the Old and New Testaments, are divided into, and teach, these two parts, namely, the law and the divine promises. In some places they present to us the law, and in others they offer us grace through the glorious promises of Christ; for example, the Old Testament, when it promises the coming Christ, and through him offers eternal blessings, eternal salvation, righteousness, and eternal life; or the New, when Christ, after his advent, promises in the Gospel, the remission of sins, eternal righteousness and life.

In this place, however, we call the law the Ten Commandments of God, wherever they appear in the Scriptures. It is not our purpose here to speak of the ceremonies and judicial laws.

Now, of these two parts our adversaries choose the law. For since the natural law, which agrees with the law of Moses or the Ten Commandments, is inborn and written in the hearts of all men, and human reason is therefore able, in some measure, to comprehend and understand the Ten Commandments, it imagines that the law is sufficient, and that remission of sin can be obtained through it.

But the Ten Commandments require not only an honorable life, or good works, externally, which reason can to some extent produce; they demand much higher things, beyond all human power and the reach of reason: namely, the law requires us to fear and love God with all sincerity, and from the bottom of our hearts; to call upon him in every time of need, and place our trust in nothing else.

Again, the law demands, that we neither doubt nor waver, but conclude with the utmost certainty in our hearts, that God is with us, hears our prayers, and grants our petitions; it demands, that in

the midst of death we expect life and all manner of consolation from God ; that in all our troubles we conform entirely to his will ; that we shall not flee from him in death and affliction, but be obedient to him, and bear and suffer willingly, whatever may befall us.

Here the scholastics have followed the philosophers ; and when they attempt to define, how man is justified before God, they teach only the righteousness and piety, of a correct external deportment before the world, and of good works, and in addition devise the dream, that human reason is able without the aid of the Holy Ghost, to love God above all things. For it is true, undoubtedly, that when the human heart is at ease and free from trouble and temptation, and does not feel the wrath and judgment of God, it may imagine that it loves God above all things and does much good and many works for God's sake ; but this is mere hypocrisy. Yet in this manner our adversaries have taught, that men *merit* the remission of sins, if they do as much as lies in their power ; that is, if reason regrets sin, and elicits also a willingness to love God.

Since men are naturally inclined to the idea, that their merits and works are of some value in the sight of God, this false principle has brought forth innumerable, perverted methods of worship in the church : for example, monastic vows, the abuse of masses, and the like, without number ; new modes of worship being constantly devised out of this error. And in order that such confidence in our merits and works might be still farther disseminated, they impudently maintained, that the Lord God must of necessity give grace unto those who do such good works ; not indeed, that he is compelled, but because this is the order, which God will not transgress or alter.

In these opinions, in this very doctrine, many other gross, pernicious errors, and horrid blasphemies against God are embraced and hidden ; to state all of which now, would require too much time. But we beg every Christian reader to consider for God's sake : If we can be justified before God and become Christians through such works, I would like to hear, (and we pray all of you to make every effort to reply,) what the difference would be between the doctrines of the philosophers and of Christ ; if we can obtain the remission of sins through such works of ours, what benefit, then, is Christ to us ? If we can become holy and pious in the sight of God, by natural reason and our own good works, what need have we then of the blood and death of Christ, or to be born anew through him ? as Peter says in his first Epistle 1, 3. This dangerous error (taught publicly in the schools and from the pulpit) has, alas, led even eminent theologians at Lyons, Paris, and other places, to recognize no Chris-

tian piety or righteousness, but that taught in philosophy ; although every letter and syllable of Paul teaches differently ; yet, while this ought reasonably to surprise us, and we could justly deride their views, they laugh at us, yea, ridicule Paul himself.

So greatly has this shameful, abominable error prevailed ! I myself heard a reputable minister, who did not mention Christ and the Gospel, but preached the ethics of Aristotle, (*Aristotelis ethicos*). Is not such preaching puerile and foolish among Christians ? If, however, the doctrine of our adversaries be true, then are these ethics (*ethici*), an invaluable collection of sermons, and a fine new bible. For it is not easy for any one to write better than Aristotle, with regard to an external, honorable life.

We see, that some learned men have written books, in which they endeavor to show, that the words of Christ and the sayings of Socrates and Zeno harmonize beautifully, as if Christ had come to give us good laws and commandments, through which to merit the remission of our sins ; instead of proclaiming to us the grace and peace of God and imparting the Holy Spirit, through his own merits and blood.

Hence, if we receive the doctrine of our adversaries, that we can merit the forgiveness of our sins, by the powers of natural reason and our own works, we are Aristotelians and not Christians, and there is no difference between an honorable Heathen, a Pharisaic, and a Christian life, between philosophy and the Gospel.

Now although our adversaries, in order not to pass by the name of Christ in total silence, as barbarous, impious heathens, speak of faith as being a knowledge of the history of Christ ; and although they do tell us something of Christ—namely, that he has gained for us a *habitus*, or, as they term it, *primam gratiam*, the first or original grace, which they regard as an inclination, or a desire, by which we are enabled to love God more easily, than we could otherwise ; yet a very weak and insignificant influence would thus be exerted by Christ, or by this *habitus*.

Nevertheless they say, that the operations of our reason and will, before this *habitus* exists, as well as afterwards, when the *habitus* is present, are *ejusdem speciei*, that is, one and the same thing, before as well as after.

For they maintain that our reason and human will are of themselves able to love God ; but that the *habitus* creates a desire, which enables reason to accomplish, with greater ease and pleasure, what it before had the power to do.

Hence they also teach, that this *habitus* must be merited or earn-

ed by our previous works, and that, through the works of the law, we merit an increase of this good inclination and eternal life.

Thus these men conceal Christ from us, and bury him anew, so that it is impossible for us to recognize him as a Mediator; for they bury in silence the doctrine, that we obtain remission of our sins through him, by grace alone, without any merit of our own; and even set up their dreams, that we can merit forgiveness of our sins by good works and the works of the law; although the whole Bible teaches, that we are unable to keep or fulfil the law. And as human reason performs no part of the law, except external works, and does not really fear God, so it neither believes, that it is observed of God. Although they speak thus concerning the *habitus*, it is certain, that, without faith in Christ, real love to God cannot exist in the heart; nor can any one comprehend, what love to God is, without faith.

In devising a distinction however between *merito congrui** and *merito condigni*,† they are playing with and contending about words only, in order that they may not appear openly as Pelagians. For if God must of necessity confer his grace as a reward for *congruity*, then it is not really *congruity*, but an actual duty, it is *justice* or *condignity*. They themselves do not know, however, what they say; for they invent and dream, that when the “*habitus*” of the love of God (of which mention is made above) is present, a man merits the grace of God *de congruo*; and yet they admit that no one can be certain of the presence of this *habitus*.

Pray, how then, or when, do they know, to what extent they earn the Lord’s grace; whether by *congruity* or by *condignity*, in part or in whole? But, alas, merciful God! These are all the cold thoughts and dreams of idle, wicked, and inexperienced men, who do not often make use of the Bible; who do not know nor experience, what a sinner feels, what the attacks of death and the devil are; who do not know at all, how entirely we forget all our merit and works, when the heart feels the wrath of God, or when the conscience is filled with terror. Secure, inexperienced men constantly pass on in the delusion, that they merit grace by their works *de congruo*.

* *Congruity, in school divinity*,—The good actions which are supposed to render it meet and equitable that God should confer grace on those who perform them. The merit of congruity is a sort of imperfect qualification for the gift and reception of God’s grace.—MILNER.

† *Condignity, in school divinity*,—The merit of human actions which claims reward, on the score of justice.—MILNER.

For it is implanted in us by nature, highly to esteem ourselves and our works. But when the heart truly feels its sins and wretchedness, then all levity and frivolous thoughts give way to real and great seriousness; then the heart and conscience will not be quieted or satisfied, but will seek works upon works, and desires to have certainty, a foundation on which to stand and rest firmly. But these alarmed consciences deeply feel, that they can merit nothing either *de condigno* or *de congruo*, and soon sink into hopelessness and despair, unless a doctrine different from the law be preached to them; namely, the Gospel of Christ, proclaiming that he was given for us.

Thus it is related of the Barefoot monks, that they, after vainly praising, for a long time, their order and good works to several pious persons in the hour of death, were at last obliged to be silent about their order and St. Franciscus, and to say, "*Dear friend, Christ hath died for thee.*" This afforded relief in trouble; this alone brought peace and consolation.

Thus our adversaries teach nothing but the external piety of external good works, which Paul calls the piety of the law; and thus, like the Jews, they see the veiled face of Moses, only strengthening security and hardness of heart in some hypocrites; they lead men upon a sandy foundation, upon their own works, by which means Christ and the Gospel are despised, and give many miserable consciences cause for despair; for they do good works relying upon false conceits, and, never experiencing the great power of faith, they at last sink into despair.

We, however, hold and assert of external piety, that God requires and demands such an external correct life; and that on account of God's commandment, we must perform the good works prescribed in the Ten Commandments. For the law is our schoolmaster, Gal. 3, 24, and is given for the unrighteous. It is the will of the Lord, our God, that gross sins should be restrained by external discipline; and for this purpose, he has given laws, established governments, provided men of learning and wisdom, who are fitted to govern. Human reason can, to some extent, by its own powers, produce an honorable external deportment like this; although it is often hindered in doing so, by innate weakness and the arts of the devil.

Now, although I am willing to allow to this external life and such good works, all the praise that is properly due them;—for in this life and in worldly matters, there is nothing better than honesty and virtue, as Aristotle says: "Neither the morning nor the evening star is more lovely and beautiful than honesty and righteousness," God himself rewarding such virtue with temporal gifts,—yet, we should

not extol good works and such a deportment so as to bring contumely on Christ. The opinion that we must merit the remission of our sins by our works, is certainly a fiction and an error.

It is likewise false and untrue, that a man can become righteous and pious before God by his own works and by external piety.

It is unfounded and false, that human reason is able of itself to love God above all things, to keep his commandments, to fear him, to be assured that he hears our prayers, to thank and obey him in afflictions, and in other things enjoined in his law, such as, not to covet the goods of others, &c. For all this, human reason is not able to accomplish, although it can in some degree produce an honorable life externally, and perform good works.

To say that those are without sin, who keep God's commandments externally only, without the Spirit and grace in their hearts, is also untrue and deceptive, and a blasphemy against Christ.

This conclusion is attested, not only by the holy Scriptures, but also by the ancient Fathers. Augustine treats of this subject largely, in contending against the Pelagians, that grace is not given on account of our own merits. And in his book on Nature and Grace, (*de Natura et Gratia*), he says: "If our natural strength is sufficient, by freewill, both to teach us how to live, and how to live aright, then Christ died in vain."

Why should I not here exclaim with Paul, Gal. 5, 4, Rom. 10, 3, 4? yea, I may justly exclaim with him: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace." "For they, being ignorant of God's righteousness, and going about to establish their own righteousness, have not submitted themselves unto the righteousness of God." For as Christ is the end of the law, so also is Christ the Savior of corrupted nature. Again, John 8, 36: "If the Son therefore shall make you free, ye shall be free indeed."

Therefore we cannot become free from our sins, or merit their remission, through reason or good works. Again, it is written, John 3, 5: "Except a man be born of water, and of the Spirit, he cannot enter into the kingdom of God."

Now if it be necessary to be born again of the Holy Ghost, our good works or our own merit will not justify us before God; nor can we keep or fulfil the law. Again, Rom. 3, 53: "For all have sinned, and come short of the glory of God;" that is, they are wanting in the wisdom and righteousness which avail in the sight of God, and through which they rightly know, honor, and praise him. Again, Rom. 8, 7, 8: "Because the carnal mind is enmity against

God : for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be. So then, they that are in the flesh cannot please God."

These passages of Scripture are so exceedingly clear and plain, that they require no very keen intellect to understand them ; we need only to read them and properly examine the plain words. As Augustine says on this subject : " If human reason and being carnal minded constitute enmity against God, then, without the Holy Ghost, no man can love God with his whole heart. Again, if to be carnal minded is enmity against God, then indeed are even the best works of the children of Adam impure and sinful ; for if the flesh cannot be obedient to the law of God, then in truth does a man commit sin, even when performing noble, lovely, and excellent works, which the world highly esteems."

Our adversaries consider only the commandments of the second table of Moses which treats of external honesty, a virtue which human reason more readily comprehends ; and they imagine, that by these external good works they keep God's law. But they do not consider the first table, which requires us to love God with our whole heart, firmly to believe that God is wroth on account of sin, sincerely to fear God, and to be fully assured that God is near us and hears our prayers, &c.

Now we are all so constituted from Adam, previous to our being born again through the Holy Ghost, that our hearts, in their security, despise God's wrath, judgment, and threats, and hate and oppose his judgments and penalties. Now if all the children of Adam are born so deeply in sin, that we naturally despise God, and doubt his Word, his promises, and his threats ; then indeed must the best of our good works, performed previous to our being born anew through the Holy Ghost, be sinful and condemned in God's sight, although to the world they may appear lovely ; for they proceed out of a bad, ungodly, and impure heart ; as Paul says, Rom. 14, 23 : " Whatsoever is not of faith, is sin." For all such self-righteous men perform works without faith, despise God in their hearts, and believe as little as Epicurus, that God takes care of them. Their contempt of God within, must necessarily make their works impure and sinful, although they may appear beautiful before men ; for God searches the heart.

Finally, it is extremely foolish and improper, on the part of our adversaries, to contend that even those, who deserve eternal wrath, obtain forgiveness of sin through love, or *actum elicited dilectionis*, self-selected works of love : whereas it is clearly impossible to love God, until the heart has taken hold of the remission of sins through faith.

For a heart, filled with anxiety, and truly feeling the wrath of God, can never love him, until he gives it relief and comfort, and assures it of his grace. For while he terrifies and assails us, as if he would cast us off in eternal wrath, into everlasting death, our poor, feeble nature must lose all courage and hope, and tremble before the great anger, which terrifies, and punishes so fearfully ; and it cannot feel a spark of love, until God himself comforts and relieves it.

The idle and inexperienced may indeed devise for themselves a dream of love ; hence they contend so frivolously, that one who is guilty even of mortal sin, can yet love God above all things ; for they have never fully realized what a burden sin is, or how great a torment it is to feel the wrath of God.

But pious hearts that have experienced this, in real strife against Satan, and in real distress of conscience, know well that such words and thoughts are nothing but fancies and dreams. Paul, Rom. 4, 15, says : " The law worketh wrath." He does not say that men obtain remission of their sins through the law ; for the law always accuses the conscience and terrifies.

The law, therefore, justifies no one in the sight of God ; for an alarmed conscience flees from God and his judgments. Hence those are in error, who would merit the remission of their sins by their works, or the law.

Let this suffice concerning the righteousness of reason or of the self-righteous, as taught by our opponents. When we shall come presently to speak of the piety and righteousness which are acceptable to God and proceed from faith, the subject will of itself lead to the quotation of more passages from the Scriptures, which will equally serve to overthrow the above-named errors of our adversaries.

Since no man is able, then, by his own strength to keep the law of God, and all under sin are doomed to eternal wrath and death, we cannot, through the law, be released from sin or become just in the sight of God ; but remission of sins and righteousness are promised through Christ, who was given for us to atone for the sins of the world, and is the only Mediator and Redeemer. Now this promise is not : through Christ ye shall have grace, salvation, &c., *if ye merit it* ; but through grace alone he offers the remission of sins, as Paul says, Rom. 11, 6 : " If the remission of sins be of works, then it is no more grace." And in another place, Rom. 3, 21 : " But now the righteousness of God without the law is manifest ;" that is, remission of sins is offered gratuitously, or without price.

Therefore it is not through our merit, that we are reconciled to

God; for if it depended upon our merit, and if reconciliation to God and remission of sin came of the law, then were all lost, and slightly indeed should we be united and reconciled to God. For we do not keep the law, nor have we power to keep it; consequently we should never obtain the promised grace and reconciliation.

For thus Paul concludes, Rom. 4, 14: "For if they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." Now, were the promise founded upon our merit and the law, it would follow, since we cannot keep the law, that the promise would be vain.

But if we are made just before God, solely through the grace and mercy promised in Christ, it follows, that we do not become just through our works. For what necessity would there be then for the glorious, divine promises, and how could Paul so highly praise grace and exalt it?

The Gospel therefore recommends, preaches, and applauds the righteousness which proceeds from faith in Christ and is not of the law. The law does not teach it; it is far superior to the righteousness of the law. For the law requires our works, and demands that we should be upright internally, at heart, and perfectly righteous.

But the divine promises offer to us, who are overcome by sin and death, help, grace, and reconciliation for Christ's sake, which no man can obtain through works, but alone through faith in Christ. *This faith* offers or presents to the Lord God no works, no merit of its own, but builds upon pure grace only, and knows of no other consolation or trust, than the mercy promised in Christ. Now this faith alone, when each one believes individually that Christ is given for him, obtains remission of sins for Christ's sake, and justifies us in the sight of God.

And since this faith exists, wherever there is true repentance, and raises up our hearts, when sunk in the terrors of sin and death, we are regenerated by it, and through it we receive the Holy Ghost into our hearts, who renews them, and thus enables us to keep the law of God, to fear and love him truly, and firmly to trust that Christ was given for us, that he hears our cries and prayers, and that we can commend ourselves joyfully to God's will, even in the midst of death. That faith is therefore true and genuine, which receives and obtains remission of sins without price, through grace, and does not oppose to the wrath of God its own merits and works, which would be a mere feather against a tempest, but presents Christ the Mediator; and this faith is the true knowledge of Christ.

He who thus believes, rightly apprehends the great, beneficent work of Christ, and becomes a new creature; and prior to the existence of such faith in the heart, no one can fulfil the law. Of this faith in Christ and this knowledge of him, there is not a syllable, not a tittle, in all the books of our adversaries.

We therefore censure our adversaries, for teaching only the law, concerning our works, and not the Gospel, which tells us that we are justified if we believe in Christ.

What the faith is, which justifies us before God.

Our adversaries think, that faith consists in a knowledge of, or an acquaintance with, the history of Christ; hence they teach that we can believe, even when sunk in mortal sin.

Accordingly they neither know nor say any thing of the true Christian faith, by which, Paul invariably says, we are justified before God. For those that are just and holy in the sight of God, are surely not in mortal sin. Therefore the faith, which justifies us before God, consists not only in a knowledge of the history of Christ, his birth, sufferings, &c., (for this even the devils have,) but it is the conviction, the fixed, firm confidence of our hearts, fully trusting in the promises of God, which, without our merit, offer us the remission of sin, grace, and full salvation, through Christ the Mediator. And that no one may suppose it to be a mere historical knowledge, I add that faith is the acceptance of this treasure with our whole heart, and this is not our own act, present or gift, our own work or preparation; but the heart must be assured and fully trust, that God presents and gives to us, and not we to *him*; that *he* pours out upon us the whole treasure of grace in Christ.

From this it is easy to perceive the difference between faith, and the piety produced by the law. For faith is a divine worship and service, (*latria*), in which we are the recipients of gifts; but the righteousness of the law is a worship which offers our works to God. Accordingly, God requires us to worship him through faith, that we may receive from him what he promises and offers.

Faith, however, is not a mere historical knowledge, but a conviction which firmly cleaves to the divine promises, as Paul fully shows, when he says, Rom. 4, 16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure to all the seed."

Here Paul so connects the two, that faith, &c., must follow promises; and again, reciprocally, where promises are given, God also requires faith.

But we can show even more plainly, what justifying faith is, by referring to our own Creed and Faith; for the Symbol says: I believe in the *remission of sin*. Hence it is not enough for us to know or believe that Christ was born, that he suffered and rose from the dead, but we must also believe the article which sets forth the final object of all this, namely, “I believe that my sins are forgiven me.” To this article all the rest must be referred, namely, that our sins are forgiven for Christ’s sake, and not on account of our merit. For why should God give Christ for our sins, if our merit could atone for them?

Therefore, whenever we speak of justifying faith, (*sic justificate*), it includes first, the divine promises; secondly, that they offer grace freely and without our merit; thirdly, that the blood of Christ and his merits are the treasure which atones for our sins. The promises are received through faith; but as they offer grace without merit, all our worthiness and merit fall to the ground, and grace and boundless mercy alone are praised. The merit of Christ is the treasure; for that must indeed be a treasure and a noble pledge, which pays for the sins of the whole world.

All the Scriptures, of the Old and New Testaments, when speaking of God and faith, often use the expressions—goodness, mercy; and in all their writings the holy Fathers teach, that we are saved by grace, goodness, and forgiveness. Now whenever we find the word *mercy* in the Scriptures, or in the writings of the Fathers, we must remember, that it refers to faith, which embraces the promise of such mercy. Again, whenever the Scriptures speak of faith, they mean the faith which is based upon grace alone. For faith does not justify us before God, as though it were in itself our work, and our own, but solely because it receives the grace, promised and offered without merit and presented out of the rich treasures of mercy.

Such faith and trust in the mercy of God are extolled, particularly in the Prophets and Psalms, as the highest and the most holy worship of God. For although the law does not, like the Gospel, *chiefly* preach grace and the remission of sin, yet the promises respecting the coming Christ were handed down from one Patriarch to the other, and they knew and believed, that God would give blessings, grace, comfort, and salvation, through Christ, the blessed seed.

Hence, if they understood that Christ was to be the treasure, paying for our sins, they knew that our works could never pay off so great a debt. They therefore received grace, salvation, and remission of sin, without any merit, and were saved through faith in the

divine promises and the Gospel of Christ, as well as we, or the saints in the New Testament.

Hence the frequent repetition of the words mercy, goodness, faith, in the Psalms and Prophets; as, in Psalm 130, 3-6: "If thou, LORD, shouldst mark iniquities, O LORD, who shall stand?" Here David confesses his sins, and boasts of no merit; but continues: "But *there is* forgiveness with thee, that thou mayest be feared." Now he is comforted again, relies on grace and mercy, trusts in the divine promises, and says: "My soul waiteth for the Lord, and in his word do I hope." And again: "My soul waiteth for the Lord;" that is, as thou hast promised forgiveness of sin, I will hold to thy word; I will trust and rely upon thy gracious promises. Thus the holy Patriarchs were justified in the sight of God, not by the law, but by the promises of God and by faith.

It must indeed be surprising to every one, that our opponents teach so little (or nothing at all) of faith, when they see in almost every syllable of the Bible, that faith is praised and extolled as the most noble, holy, and acceptable, the greatest and best service of God. Thus in Psalm 50, 15, he says: "Call upon me in the day of trouble; and I will deliver thee." In this way, then, would God be known to us; thus he would be honored, that we may receive and accept from him grace, salvation, and every blessing, as gifts of grace, and not as a reward for our merit. This is a most precious knowledge, a powerful consolation in every affliction, bodily and spiritual, in life or in death, as the pious well know. But our opponents deprive the poor conscience of this noble, precious, and sweet consolation, when they treat faith so coldly and contemptuously, and instead of it plead their own miserable, beggarly works and merits before the supreme God.

We are justified by faith in Christ.

In order that no one may think we are speaking of a mere knowledge of the history of Christ, we must state, in the first place, in what manner the heart begins to believe, and how it attains faith. Afterwards we shall show, that this faith justifies before God, and how this is to be understood; and we shall endeavor, properly, clearly and fully to refute the arguments of our adversaries. Christ, Luke 24, 47, commands the preaching of repentance and remission of sins. The Gospel also charges all men with being born in sin, and being worthy of eternal wrath and death, and offers them remission of sin and righteousness through Christ, which are received through faith.

For the preaching of repentance, or the call of the Gospel: *to reform, repent*,—when it truly penetrates into the heart, strikes the conscience with alarm, and is not a jest, but great terror, in which the soul feels its wretchedness and sins, and the wrath of God. While in this terror, the heart should again seek consolation, which takes place when we believe in the promise of Christ, that, through him, we receive remission of sin. The faith, which, in such fear and terror, cheers the heart and consoles it, receives and experiences remission of sin, justifies us and brings life; for this strong consolation is a new birth and a new life.

This is simple and clear language; the pious know it to be true; we have examples in the church, showing that this applies to all the saints from the beginning, as in the conversion of Paul and Augustine. Our opponents have no certainty, nor can they correctly tell us, or state, in clear and intelligible terms, how the Holy Spirit is given. They dream, that by the simple bodily reception and use of the sacraments, *ex opere operato*,* we obtain grace and receive the Holy Ghost, although the heart be entirely absent, as if the light of the Holy Ghost were so worthless, weak, and futile.

When we speak of faith, as being not an idle fancy, but a new light, life, and power in the heart, that renews the heart and disposition, transforms man into a new creature, namely, a new light and work of the Holy Ghost—every one knows, that we do not mean faith accompanied by mortal sin, as our opponents speak of it. For how can light and darkness exist together? Faith, wherever, and while it exists, bears good fruit, as we shall hereafter show.

This is certainly a clear and simple exposition of the sinner's true conversion, and of regeneration. Now we defy all the Sententiaries to produce, from their innumerable commentaries, glossaries, and writings on doctrinal opinions, even one, that in the least correctly sets forth the conversion of the sinner. When they speak of love, or of their *habitu dilectionis*, they introduce their own dreams, that men earn or merit this *habitu* by their works; but do not say a word about God's promises and Word, like the Anabaptists of the present time.

Now we cannot barter with God; he cannot be known, sought, or comprehended, except in and through his Word alone; as Paul says, Rom. 1, 16: "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth;" again, Rom. 10, 17: "Faith cometh by hearing." This, of itself, shows clearly enough, that we are jus-

* That is, when merely the external act is performed.

justified before God by faith alone. For, if we come to God and are justified alone through his Word, and if no one can comprehend that word, except by faith, it follows, that faith justifies. There are other considerations, however, which better illustrate this subject.

Thus far I have endeavored to show, how we are born anew, and what the faith, of which we speak, *is* and *is not*.

We shall now show, that this faith, and nothing else, justifies us before God. First I would remind the reader, that as the truth, that *Christ is our only Mediator*, must and shall always stand, irrefutably, so also no one can deny, that *through faith we are justified without works*. For how can Christ be and remain the Mediator, unless, through faith, we hold to him as the Mediator, and thus become reconciled to God; unless we firmly believe, that for his sake we are just before God? Now this is faith, to confide in and rely on the merits of Christ, that for his sake God will assuredly be merciful unto us. As clearly as the Scriptures say, that besides the law the promises of Christ are necessary for salvation, they also teach that faith justifies. The law does not preach remission of sin through grace. Again, we cannot fulfil or keep the law, till we receive the Holy Ghost.

Accordingly we must insist, that the promises of Christ are necessary to salvation, and no one can comprehend or receive them except through faith alone. Those therefore, who teach that we are not justified before God through faith, suppress Christ and the Gospel, and teach the law.

Some, perhaps, when we say that faith justifies before God, apply this merely to the beginning; namely, that faith is only the beginning of, or preparation for justification; not that faith itself makes us acceptable to God, but rather the love and works that follow it. They imagine that faith is commended in the Scriptures, simply because it is a *beginning* of good works,—as much always depends upon the beginning. But this is not our view, for we hold, on this subject, that we become acceptable to God through faith *itself*.

And as the word *justificari* (to be justified, made just,) is used in two different ways, namely, to designate being converted or born anew, and again in the sense of being esteemed just, we shall first show, that we are converted from evil, impious ways, born anew, and justified by faith alone.

Some earnestly contend against the word *sola*, alone; yet Paul clearly says, Rom. 3, 28: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law." Again, Ephes.

2, 8: "It is the gift of God, not of yourselves, not of works, lest any man should boast;" and the same in Rom. 3, 24.

Now if this *word*, this *exclusiva sola*, (the expression *alone*, which excludes every thing else,) is so objectionable to some, they may erase *these* words also, wherever found in the epistles of Paul: "*through grace*"—"not of works"—"*the gift of God*," &c., "*lest any man should boast*," and the like; for they are very decidedly exclusive (*exclusivæ*.) The words, "*through grace*" exclude merit and all works whatsoever.

And by the word *sola*, when we say that faith alone makes us righteous, we do not exclude the Gospel and the sacraments, and by holding that faith alone accomplishes all, invalidate the word and sacraments, as our opponents misinterpret our views on all subjects; but *we exclude* our *own* merit. We have plainly stated above, that faith comes through the word. We therefore exalt the ministry and the word more highly than our adversaries do, and say, besides, that love and works must follow faith.

We do not, therefore, exclude works by the word *sola*, or hold that they should not follow; but it is the confidence in our own merit and works that we exclude; and say that *they* do not merit remission of sins. This we shall hereafter show more fully and clearly.

That we obtain remission of sins through faith alone in Christ.

We think our opponents must acknowledge, that above all things remission of sins is necessary to justification; for we are all born in sin. Hence we infer:

That, when we obtain the remission of sin, we are righteous and pious in the sight of God; according to Psalm 32, 1: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven."

But solely through faith in Christ, not through love, nor on account of love or works, do we obtain the remission of sin, although love follows faith.

It must follow therefore, that we are justified by faith alone. For the sinner's justification means, that he is changed into a pious being, and born anew of the Holy Ghost.* But we shall presently endeavor to show that we obtain remission of sin by faith alone, (as the minor says,) and not through love.

Our opponents have been trifling with these important things. They

* This is the first or *major* proposition; and now follows the *minor*, i. e., the other proposition of the preceding argument.

ask, whether the remission of sin and the infusion of grace are one change, or two. It seems impossible for these idle, ignorant men to treat these things properly; for, to have a real sense of sin and of the wrath of God, is not an unimportant or trifling subject; nor is the consciousness of the remission of sin a feeble consolation.

Thus Paul says, 1 Cor. 15, 56, 57: "The sting of death is sin; and the strength of sin is the law. But thanks be to God who giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ." That is, sin alarms the conscience; this is done by the law, which shows us the earnest zeal and wrath of God against sin; but through Christ we conquer. How is this effected? When we believe—when our hearts are lifted up by the promises of grace through Christ, and rely upon them. Thus we prove, that we obtain remission of sins, by faith in Christ, and not by works; that is, God cannot be reconciled or his wrath appeased by our works, but Christ alone is the Mediator and Conciliator, and for his sake alone is the Father merciful to us.

Now no one by works can embrace Christ as a Mediator; but only by believing the word which proclaims him a Mediator.

Therefore, when our souls are comforted and lifted up by the divine promises made to us for Christ's sake, we obtain the remission of sin by faith alone. For Paul says, Rom. 5, 2, that through him we have access to the Father; and he adds expressly—*by faith*.

In this way, and in no other, are we reconciled to the Father, receiving the remission of our sins, when we are encouraged to hold fast to the promise, in which grace and mercy are held out to us through Christ.

Our opponents hold respecting Christ, the Mediator and Conciliator, that he earns love, or the *habitus dilectionis*, for us. They do not say, that he must be our only Mediator, but rather bury him again, and pretend that we have access to God through our works, that through these works we merit the *habitus*, and can then come to God, by means of love.

This is indeed burying Christ anew, and taking away the whole doctrine of faith. But Paul, on the contrary, clearly teaches that we have access, that is, are reconciled to God through Christ. In order to show how this is effected, he adds that we have this access *through faith*, obtain remission of our sins by faith, through the merit of Christ, and cannot appease God's anger, except through Christ. It is therefore very clear, that we do not merit forgiveness by our works or love.

Secondly, it is certain that sins are remitted, for the sake of the Propitiator Christ, Rom. 3, 25; "Whom God hath set forth to be

a propitiation" or Conciliator ; and it is expressly added—"through faith." Accordingly we can avail ourselves of the Conciliator's worth, by embracing the promises of mercy through faith, and setting it up against the wrath and judgment of God. And the same is written in Heb. 4, 14, 15 : *We have a High Priest Christ, &c. Let us go to him with joyfulness.* The Apostle tells us to approach God, not relying on our own works, but trusting in the High Priest Christ. He therefore clearly requires faith.

Thirdly, Peter says, Acts 10, 43 : "To him give all the Prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins." How could Peter have expressed himself more clearly ? He says, we receive remission of sin through his name ; that is, we receive it through *him* not through *our* merit, not through *our* repentance (or attrition,) not through *our* love, not by *our* own service of God, not by our human ordinances or works ; and he adds—*if we believe in him.*

He therefore requires faith to exist in the heart. For that reason he says : "To him give all the Prophets witness." This, it seems to me, is truly appealing to the Christian or universal church ; for if all the holy Prophets bear witness, their decision and testimony are truly glorious, grand, excellent, and forcible ; but of this passage we shall speak more hereafter.

Fourthly, remission of sin is promised for Christ's sake. Therefore, no one can obtain it, unless by faith alone. For no one can take hold of the promise or participate in it, except through faith only. Rom. 4, 16 : "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace ; to the end the promise might be sure." Precisely as if he should say, that if our salvation and righteousness depended on our own merit, the promise of God would yet be uncertain and useless to us ; for we could never know with certainty, when our merits would suffice. The pious heart and Christian conscience know this full well, and would not for a thousand worlds that our salvation depended upon ourselves. Paul agrees with this view, Gal. 3, 22 : "The Scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe." Here Paul casts aside all our merit ; for he says we are all worthy of death, and concluded under sin ; he calls to mind the divine promise, by which alone we can obtain the forgiveness of sin ; and further adds how we become participants of the promise, namely, by faith. This argument, drawn by Paul from the very nature of the divine promise, namely, that as God's promise is certain and must remain sure, (as it will not fail to do,) remission of sin cannot proceed from

our merit; else it would be uncertain, and we could not know when our merits would suffice; yes, I say, this argument, this foundation, is a firm rock; it is almost the strongest in the whole of Paul's writings, and is very often repeated and quoted in all the epistles.

No one on earth will ever be able to devise, invent, or contrive any thing, by which *this* argument alone, if there were no other, can be overthrown. Nor will the pious and conscientious Christian by any means permit himself to be led away from the position, that we receive remission of sins by faith alone, for the sake of Christ's merits. For in this they have a sure, firm, and eternal consolation against sin and the devil, death and hell; while every thing else rests on a sandy foundation, and is insufficient in the hour of temptation.

Now, as we obtain remission of sin, and receive the Holy Ghost, through faith only, faith alone justifies us in the sight of God: For those who are reconciled to God, are righteous in his sight, and are his children; not on account of their purity, but because of God's mercy, if they accept and embrace it through faith.

Therefore the Scriptures testify, that we are justified before God by faith. We shall now cite passages which clearly state, that by faith we are made pious and righteous—not that our faith is a work so precious and pure, but solely because by faith, and by no other means, we receive the mercy offered.

In the Epistle to the Romans, Paul treats particularly of the manner in which we are justified before God; and arrives at the conclusion, that all those who believe that God is merciful to them through Christ, are justified before God by faith, without merit. And this forcible conclusion, this proposition, in which is comprehended the main subject of the whole epistle, yea, of all the Scriptures, he lays down clearly and unequivocally in the third chapter to the Romans and the 28th verse: "Therefore we conclude that a man is justified by faith without the deeds of the law."

Our adversaries here contend, that Paul excluded only the Jewish ceremonies, not other virtuous works. Paul, however, does not speak of ceremonies only, but properly and assuredly of all other works, and of the whole law, or Ten Commandments. For in the 7th verse of the 7th chapter he afterwards quotes the passage from the Decalogue: "Thou shalt not covet." Now if we could obtain remission of sin by works, which are not embraced in the Jewish ceremonies, and thus merit righteousness, what need would there be of Christ and his promises? Every thing that Paul said in various places concerning the promises, would here be overthrown at once. He would

be in error, when writing to the Ephesians, 2, 8, 9: "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God; not of works." Again, in the Epistle to the Romans, chap. 4, 1-6, Paul alleges of Abraham and David:—They had received a commandment from God concerning circumcision. Now if any works justify before God, then the works, which God had commanded at that time, must also have justified.

But Augustine clearly maintains, that Paul is speaking of the whole law; and he argues this at length, in his work concerning the spirit and the letter, (*de Spiritu et Litera*), when he finally says: "Having now weighed and treated this subject, according to the strength which God has given us, we arrive at the conclusion, that no man is justified by the precepts enjoining a good life, but by faith in Jesus Christ."

Let no one, however, suppose, that Paul's declaration—"Man is justified by faith alone"—was made inadvertently; for he teaches this doctrine at length in the fourth chapter to the Romans, verses 4 and 5, and repeats it in all his epistles. In the fourth chapter he says: "Now to him that worketh is the reward not reckoned of grace, but of debt; but to him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness."

It is evident, from these words, that faith is the same thing that he calls the righteousness of God; and he adds, that it is reckoned of grace, and that it could not be counted to us of grace, if works or merit had any thing to do with it. For this reason, undoubtedly, he excludes all works and all merit, not only Jewish ceremonies, but all other good works also; for if we were justified before God by these works, faith would not be counted to us for righteousness without works, as Paul explicitly says. And he adds: "We say that Abraham's faith was counted unto him for righteousness." Again, chapter 5, 1: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God through our Lord Jesus Christ"—that is, our consciences have joy and peace before God.

Rom. 10, 10: "For with the heart man believeth unto righteousness." Here he calls faith the righteousness of the heart.

Gal. 2, 16: "We have believed in Jesus Christ, that we might be justified by the faith of Christ, and not by the works of the law."

Eph. 2, 8: "For by grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves: it is the gift of God: not of works, lest any man should boast."

John 1, 12, 13: "But as many as received him, to them gave he

power to become the sons of God, even to them that believe on his name: Which were born; not of blood, nor of the will of the flesh, nor of the will of man, but of God."

John 3, 14, 15: "And as Moses lifted up the serpent in the wilderness, even so must the Son of Man be lifted up; that whosoever believeth in him should not perish."

John 3, 17: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned."

Acts 13, 38, 39: "Be it known unto you, therefore, men and brethren, that through this man is preached unto you the forgiveness of sins: And by him, all that believe are justified from all things, from which ye could not be justified by the law of Moses." How could he have been more explicit in regard to the kingdom of Christ and justification? He says that the law could justify no one; and that Christ was given that we should believe that we are justified through him. He says in plain terms, that the law can justify no man; therefore righteousness is accounted to us through Christ, if we *believe* that God is gracious unto us through him.

Acts 4, 11, 12: "This is the stone which was set at naught of you builders, which is become the head of the corner. Neither is there salvation in any other: for there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved."

We cannot, however, believe on the name of Christ, except by hearing his merit preached, and by embracing it. By faith in the name of Christ, therefore, and not by confidence in our own works, are we saved. For the word, *name*, here signifies the cause through and for which salvation comes. Therefore, the praise and confession of the name of Christ, signifies trust in him, who alone is called, who is Christ, being the cause of our salvation and the treasure by which we are redeemed.

Acts 15, 9: "He purified their hearts by faith." Hence the faith, spoken of by the Apostles, is not a mere historical knowledge, but a powerful and vigorous operation of the Holy Ghost, which changes the heart.

Hab. 2, 4: "The just shall live by his faith." Here we are told in the first place, that the just are made just by faith, if they believe that God is merciful through Christ; and secondly, that faith produces life. Faith alone gives peace and joy to the heart and conscience, and eternal life, which begins here on earth.

Isa. 53, 11: "By his knowledge shall my righteous servant justify many." Now what is the knowledge of Christ, but a sense

of his benefits and his promises, which he preached and made known to the world? To have a knowledge of these benefits is, to *believe* truly in Christ, to believe that God will certainly give what he has promised through Christ. But the Scriptures abound with such declarations and testimony. They treat of both, the law of God and his promises. Now the promises speak of the forgiveness of sins and the reconciliation of God through Christ.

And in the writings of the Fathers we find many similar declarations. Thus Ambrose writes to Irenæus: "But the whole world is therefore subject to God, subdued by the law; for, by the commandments of the law, we are all accused: but by the works of the law, no one is justified. Through the law sin is made known to us, but guilt is removed by faith. It appears, indeed, as if the law had done harm, by including all under sin; but Christ the Lord has come, and remitted our sins which we could not avoid; and has blotted out the hand-writing, by the shedding of his blood. This is what Paul says to the Romans, 5, 20: 'The law entered, that the offence might abound: but where sin abounded, grace did much more abound' through Jesus. For, inasmuch as the whole world is guilty, he has taken away the sins of the whole world: as John testifies, John 1, 29: 'Behold the Lamb of God, which taketh away the sin of the world.' Therefore no one should boast of his works, because no one is justified by his own deeds; but he that is just, is made so in baptism, in Christ, since he became justified. For it is faith that releases us, through the blood of Christ, and blessed is he, whose sins are forgiven him, and to whom grace is come."

These plain words of Ambrose evidently coincide with our doctrine. He says that works do not justify us, and that faith redeems us through the blood of Christ. All the high-titled Sententiaries, (some are styled *angelici*, others *subtiles*, others again *irrefragabiles*, that is, doctors who are infallible,) together with all their works, throw less light on the meaning of Paul, than this single paragraph from Ambrose.

In this sense Augustine also has written much, in opposition to the Pelagians, and in his work: Of the Spirit and Letter (*de Spiritu et Litera*) he says: "The law, with its righteousness, is set before us, in order that he, who keeps it, may live by it, and that all, when they know their infirmity, may come to God, who alone justifies, not through their own strength, nor the letter of the law, which we cannot fulfil, but through faith. No one can do a truly good work, unless he first be righteous and godly; but righteousness is attained through faith alone." Here he plainly says that God, who alone

blesse and sanctifies us, is reconciled through faith, and that faith makes us pious and just in the sight of God.

Again, immediately afterwards: "The law works fear, but through faith we hope and trust in God. From those who fear the penalty, grace is concealed. In this fear, when a man is in anxiety, &c., through faith he must flee to the mercy of God, that He may give what he has commanded in the law, and grant his grace." Thus he teaches, that by the law the heart is terrified, and through faith consoled again.

It is really strange, that our adversaries can be so blind, and overlook so many plain passages which clearly state that we are justified by faith and not by works. What can these deluded men be thinking of? Do they suppose, that the Scriptures so often and so plainly repeat these things without design? Do they imagine, that the word of the Holy Spirit is doubtful and inconsiderate, or that he knows not what he says?

On this subject these ungodly men have fabricated the sophistry, that the passages of Scripture which speak of faith, must be applied to *fide formata*, which is to say, that faith makes no one godly or righteous, except on account of love or works. In short, according to their view, it is not faith that justifies us, but love alone; for they say, that faith is compatible with mortal sin. What is this but overthrowing all the promises of God and the pledges of grace, and preaching works and the law?

If faith obtains grace and the remission of sins on account of love, the forgiveness of sin must always be uncertain; because we never love God as fervently as we ought; nay, we cannot love God, until we are assured that our sins are remitted. Hence, when our opponents teach us to rely on such love to God as we are capable of, and upon our works, they entirely set aside the Gospel, which preaches the forgiveness of sins, while no one can really feel or understand such love to God, except he believe, that by grace he obtains remission of sins through Christ, without price.

We also say, that love must follow faith, as Paul tells us, Gal. 5, 6: "For in Jesus Christ neither circumcision availeth any thing, nor uncircumcision; but faith, which worketh by love." But we must not, therefore, put our trust in love, or build upon it, as if we obtained the remission of sins and reconciliation with God on account of love or through it. Neither do we obtain forgiveness of sins for the sake of other works which follow, *but through faith alone*. The promises of God cannot be taken hold of by works, but by faith alone. Faith, properly speaking, or *fides proprie dicta*, is,

when our hearts and the Holy Ghost in us, declare that the promises of God are true and certain; this is the faith, of which the Scriptures speak. Now, before we perform or accomplish any thing, faith does nothing but receive and accept gifts; it is therefore counted to us for righteousness, as it was to Abraham, before we love, before we keep the law, or do any work.

Nevertheless it is true, that fruits and works follow, and that faith is not a mere historical knowledge, but a new light in the heart, and an energetic operation of the Holy Spirit, by which we are regenerated, and which gives comfort and life to the affrighted conscience. Since this faith alone obtains remission of sin, and renders us acceptable in the sight of God, it is accompanied by the Holy Ghost, and it should be styled, rather than the love which follows, *gratia gratum faciens*; that is, the grace which renders acceptable.

We have hitherto presented abundant testimony from the Fathers and the Scriptures, for the purpose of showing more clearly, that through faith alone we obtain the remission of sin for Christ's sake and are justified; that is, that the unrighteous are sanctified and regenerated. Pious souls may observe here, that this doctrine of faith is indispensable; for by it alone we learn to know Christ and his benefits, and in it alone the heart and conscience find true and indubitable rest and consolation. If there is to be a Christian church, and a Christian faith, they must preach and teach a doctrine, which places the soul, not upon error or sand, but on a foundation, on which it may firmly rely and trust.

Our adversaries, therefore, are truly unfaithful bishops, preachers, and doctors; they have hitherto given evil advice to men, and still continue to do so, by advancing doctrines, which leave them in doubt and suspense, as to the remission of their sins. For how is it possible, that those, who have not heard or do not know this important doctrine of Christ—who yet waver, and doubt whether they have forgiveness of their sins—should sustain themselves in the peril of death, and in the last gasp and agony? Again, if there is to be a Christian church, the Gospel of Christ must ever remain in it, namely, the divine promise that our sins are remitted without merit, for Christ's sake. Those, who do not inculcate the faith of which we have been speaking, suppress this holy Gospel entirely.

Now it is shocking to hear, that the scholastics have not written a particle about faith. And these our adversaries follow, rejecting this most important doctrine of faith; and they are so hardened and blind, as not to perceive, that they are thus trampling under foot

the whole Gospel, the divine promises concerning the remission of sins, and Jesus Christ himself.

III.—OF LOVE AND THE FULFILMENT OF THE LAW.

On this point our opponents meet us with the declarations, Matt. 19, 17: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments;" and Rom. 2, 13: "Not the hearers of the law are just before God, but the doers of the law shall be justified;" besides many similar passages, relative to the law and to works. Before we reply to this, it is necessary for us to state our views concerning love and the fulfilment of the law.

It is written in the Prophet Jer. 31, 33: "I will put my law in their inward parts;" and Rom. 3, 31, Paul says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law." Again, Christ says, Matt. 19, 17: "If thou wilt enter into life, keep the commandments." Paul also says to the Corinthians, 1 Cor. 13, 3: "If I have not charity, it profiteth me nothing." These and similar passages show that we must keep the law, when we are *justified* by faith, and thus increase more and more in the Spirit. We are not, however, speaking of the Mosaic ceremonies, but of the Ten Commandments, which require us to fear and love God truly, from the bottom of our hearts. Now, since faith is accompanied by the Holy Spirit, and produces in the heart a new light and life, it is true, and necessarily follows, that faith renews and changes the heart. What kind of a renovation of the heart this is, we learn from the Prophet, when he says: "I will put my law in their inward parts."

Accordingly, when we are born anew by faith, and know, that God will be merciful to us, and be our father and our helper, we begin to fear, love, thank, and praise him, to entreat and look to him for assistance, and to submit to his will in afflictions; then we also begin to love our neighbor. Then there is, within us a new heart, mind, and soul, through the Spirit of Christ.

These things cannot take place, before we are justified by faith and born anew through the Holy Spirit; because, in the first place, no one can keep the law, without the knowledge of Christ, nor can any one fulfil the law, without the Holy Spirit. But we cannot receive the Holy Ghost, except through faith, as Paul says to the Galatians 3, 14: "That we might receive the promise of the Spirit through faith."

It is, moreover, impossible for the human heart to love God by

the agency of the law or works alone. The law manifests nothing but the wrath and severity of God, it accuses us, and shows how fearfully he will chastise sin with punishments both temporal and eternal. Hence, what the scholastics teach concerning the love of God, is a wild conceit; it being impossible to love God, before we know and embrace his mercy through faith. Then only does God become (*objectum amabile*) object amiable, lovely.

Although reason may, to some extent enable us, by its innate light, to lead an honest life, and to perform the external works of the law, without Christ and the Holy Spirit, yet it is true, as we stated above, the principal parts of the divine law, that is, turning the whole heart to God, and reverencing him sincerely, (as required in the first table, and in the first and highest commandment,) cannot be kept without the Holy Spirit.

But our opponents are rude, indolent, and ignorant theologians. They consider only the second table of Moses and its works; the first table, however, in which are embraced the chief doctrines of theology, and on which all depends, they disregard entirely. Yes, this most important, exalted, and holy commandment, which exceeds all the understanding of men and angels, which concerns the highest service of God, yea, the Deity himself and the honor of the Eternal Majesty, and in which God commands us, sincerely to regard, fear, and love him, as our Lord and God, is treated by them as if it did not even belong to theology.

But Christ is given to us, that our sins may be forgiven and the Holy Spirit imparted to us, for his sake. This Spirit works new light, immortal life, and eternal righteousness in us, in order to manifest Christ in our hearts, as we find, John 16, 14: "For he shall receive of mine, and show it unto you." He works other graces also, love, thanksgiving, chastity, patience, &c. No one is able, therefore, to fulfil the law without the Holy Ghost; for this reason Paul says: "Do we then make void the law through faith? God forbid: yea, we establish the law," Rom. 3, 31; for we cannot fulfil and keep the law, until the Holy Spirit is given us.

And Paul remarks, 2 Cor. 3, 15, 16, 17, that the veil which covers the face of Moses, cannot be removed, except by faith in Christ the Lord, through whom the Holy Spirit is imparted. For thus he says: "But even unto this day, when Moses is read, the veil is upon their heart. Nevertheless, when it shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away. Now, the Lord is that Spirit: and where the Spirit of the Lord is, there is liberty." By the veil Paul means the opinions and misconceptions of men relative to the

Ten Commandments and the ceremonies; namely, that the hypocrites suppose that the law can be kept and fulfilled by the observance of external works, and that the offerings and the various services of God, *ex opere operato*, justify us in the sight of God. But this veil is drawn from our hearts, that is, our false views are removed, when God reveals our wretchedness to our hearts, and makes us sensible of his wrath and our sins. Then do we first observe, how far we are from fulfilling the law, how securely and blindly all men continue to live, and how destitute they are of the fear of God; in short, how far they are from believing, that God created heaven, earth, and all creatures, that he sustains our breath, our life, and all creation continually, and protects them against Satan. Here we first learn, that unbelief, security, and contempt of God, are so deeply concealed in us. Here we first experience, that we believe very feebly or not at all, that God forgives sins, that he hears prayer, &c. When we now hear the Word and the Gospel, and know Christ through faith, we receive the Holy Spirit, and obtain proper views of God, fear and believe in him, &c.

From this it is evident, that we cannot keep the law of God without faith, without Christ, without the Holy Ghost. For this reason also we assert, that the law must be kept, and that every believer begins to keep it, and increases more and more in the love and fear of God, which is fulfilling the commandments of God indeed. And when we speak of the keeping of the law, or of good works, we include both, the good heart internally and good works externally.

Wherefore, our adversaries do us wrong, in charging us with being silent on the subject of good works; while we not only assert, that men must do good works, but also in particular point out, that the heart must be engaged therein, if they are not vain, empty, cold, hypocritical works. Experience teaches, that although the hypocrites undertake to keep the law by their own strength, they are unable to do so, or to prove it by their deeds. For to what extent are they free from hatred, from envy, contention, rage, anger, avarice, adultery, &c.? Can greater vices be found any where, than in monasteries? Human nature is much too weak, by its own strength, to resist the devil, his artifices and power; for he holds all those captive, who are not redeemed by Christ. Divine strength and the resurrection of Christ are necessary to overcome the devil. And since we know that we become participants of Christ's strength and victory through faith, we can pray God, upon the promise given, to protect and govern us by his Spirit, that the devil may not over-

throw or ruin us ; else we shall constantly fall into error and abominable vices.

Paul therefore says, not of us, but of Christ, Eph. 4, 8 : " He led captivity captive ;" for Christ conquered the devil, and promised the Holy Ghost through the Gospel, that by his assistance we may overcome every evil. And in 1 John 3, 8, it is written : " For this purpose the Son of God was manifested, that he might destroy the works of the devil."

For these reasons, we teach not only how the law may be kept, but also how all that we do becomes pleasing to God, not because we are able, in this life, to keep the law so perfectly and purely, but because we are in Christ, as we shall hereafter show. It is evident, then, that our divines teach the truth concerning good works, and we add, that it is impossible for true faith, which comforts the heart and receives the forgiveness of sins, to be without the love of God. For, through Christ we approach the Father, and when we are reconciled to God through Christ, then only do we believe and determine fully in our hearts, that there is a true and living God, and that we have a Father in heaven, who is constantly looking down upon us, who must be feared, and should be loved on account of his unspeakable favors. Him we should always thank sincerely, and to him accord praise and honor, who hears our prayers, our sighs, and our groanings, as John says in his first Epistle, 4, 19 : " We love him, because he first loved us ;" for he gave his Son for us, and remitted our sins. Here John clearly shows, that faith goes before, and love follows.

This faith, moreover, dwells in those, who are truly penitent, whose alarmed consciences feel the wrath of God and their own sins, and seek grace and remission of sin. And in this state of alarm, anxiety, and trouble, faith first exhibits itself, and must be cherished and increased. Faith cannot, for this reason, exist in carnal minded men, who feel secure, and live after the will and the lusts of the flesh. Paul says, Rom. 8, 1 : " There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus, who walk not after the flesh, but after the Spirit." Again, verses 12, 13 : " We are debtors, not to the flesh, to live after the flesh. For if ye live after the flesh, ye shall die : but if ye through the Spirit do mortify the deeds of the body, ye shall live." Faith therefore which is found only in truly penitent souls, cannot co-exist with mortal sin, as our opponents assert. Consequently it cannot exist in those who live in a carnal manner after the world, according to the will of Satan and the lusts of the flesh.

From among these fruits and effects of faith our opponents select but one,—namely, love,—and teach that love justifies us in the sight of God ; consequently they are nothing but preachers of works, and teachers of the law. They do not, in the first place, teach that we obtain the remission of sin through faith. They do not preach Christ, the Mediator, that through him we receive the mercy of God, but speak of our love and our works ; and yet they do not tell us what kind of love it is, nor are they able to define it.

They boast of their ability to fulfil or keep the law, although the honor belongs to Christ alone. Thus they oppose their own works to the judgment of God, and maintain that they merit, *de condigno*, grace and eternal life. This is, indeed, a perfectly vain and impious confidence in their own works. For it is impossible in this life even for Christians and saints themselves, to keep the law of God perfectly ; for evil inclinations and desires always remain in us, although the Holy Ghost resists them.

Some one of them may ask : “ Since we acknowledge that love is the offspring of the Spirit, and since it is called a holy work and the fulfilment of the law, why we do not also teach that it justifies us before God ? ”

Reply,—First, most assuredly we do not receive the forgiveness of sins either through love or on account of it, but through faith alone for Christ’s sake. Faith alone in the heart looks upon the promises of God ; faith alone is the assurance, upon which the heart rests with certainty, that God is merciful—that Christ died not in vain, &c. This faith alone overcomes the terrors of sin and death. He that still wavers, or doubts that his sins are remitted, does not confide in God, but he despairs of Christ ; because he believes his sins to be greater and stronger than the death and blood of Christ ; and yet Paul says, Rom. 5, 20, that, “ Where sin abounded, grace did much more abound,” that is, it was stronger, richer, and more powerful.

Now if any one expects to obtain the remission of his sins, on account of his love, he reviles and dishonors Christ, and will discover, in his last moments, when he must appear before the judgment seat of God, the vanity of such confidence. It is therefore certain, that we are justified by faith alone. And as we do not obtain the remission of sin by good works and virtues ; such as patience, chastity, obedience to government, and yet these virtues follow faith ; so we do not obtain remission of sin on account of love to God, although it must follow faith.

But when Christ declares, Luke 7, 47 : “ Her sins, which are

many, are forgiven: for she loved much," he himself explains his words by saying verse 50: "Thy faith hath saved thee." Christ did not wish to leave the impression, that the woman merited the forgiveness of sins by her work of love; hence, he expressly declared that her faith had saved her. Now it is faith which relies on the mercy of God and his Word, and not upon works. If we believe that faith can rely both upon God and the works of men at the same time, we certainly do not understand what faith is. The alarmed conscience cannot be appeased by its own works, but must cry for mercy; and there are no other means, by which it can be consoled and relieved, but the Word of God. The narrative itself shows plainly in this place, what Christ calls love. The woman comes to Christ, confident of obtaining the remission of her sins from him. Truly this is acknowledging and honoring Christ; for greater honor than this no one can confer upon him. It is really confessing Christ, or the Messiah, to seek remission of sin from him; and to recognize Christ in this manner, to confess and receive him thus, is to believe on him sincerely.

But Christ did not use the words, "she loved much," while speaking with the woman, but when he spoke to the Pharisee. For Christ, the Lord, compared the whole honor, conferred on him by the Pharisee, with the offerings and works of the woman. He reproves the Pharisee for not recognizing him as Christ, although he was honored as a guest, and a pious and holy man. But he commends the worship of the woman, the confession of her sins, and her effort to obtain their remission from him. This noble example justly moved Christ to reprove the Pharisee, who, although a wise and honorable man, still did not believe on him. He reproached him with his unbelief, and admonished him by the example of the woman, as though he would say to the Pharisee: shame upon thee! that thou art so blind as not to recognize me as Christ and the Messiah, although thou art a teacher of the law; while this woman, poor and without learning, recognizes me.

Here, therefore, he commends not only love, but the whole *cultus*, or service of God, faith with its fruits, while speaking to the Pharisee of the fruits. Because faith in the heart cannot be shown or exhibited to others, except by its fruits; these establish the truth before men, that faith is in the heart. Christ did not mean that love and works should be the treasure, by which our sins are recompensed;—that treasure is the blood of Christ. This controversy, therefore, concerns an important and weighty matter, involving the highest, the surest, the eternal consolation of pious souls, namely, whether we

should trust in Christ's merits, or in our own works. If we trust in our own works, we rob Christ of his honor, and he ceases to be the Mediator and Conciliator; and besides we shall finally learn, that such confidence is vain, and will lead consciences only into despair; for unless we obtain remission of sin and reconciliation to God through Christ, without our merit, then no one will obtain remission of sin, without having kept the whole law. For the law cannot justify us before God, while it is our accuser. Now, no one can boast of having satisfied the law. Hence we must seek consolation elsewhere,—namely, in Christ.

Now we shall endeavor to reply to the question proposed above: why does not love, or *dilectio*, justify any one before God? Our opponents are correct in regarding love as the fulfilment of the law; hence it would be true indeed that love justifies us, provided we keep the law. But who dares to boast, who can say in truth, that he keeps the law and loves God as the law commands? We have shown above, that God gave us the promise of grace, because we are unable to keep the law. Paul, therefore, invariably says that we cannot be justified before God by the law.

Our opponents have certainly gone far astray on this point, and even mistaken the main question; because, in this matter they consider nothing but the law. Reason and the wisdom of man can come to no other conclusion, but that we must become godly through the observance of laws, and that whoever keeps the law externally is holy and just. The Gospel, however, turns us around, directing us from the law to the divine promises, and teaching that we are not justified by the law, which no one can keep; but by the gift of reconciliation for Christ's sake, which we obtain through faith alone. For before we can fulfil one tittle of the law, we must believe in Christ, through whom we are reconciled to God, and first obtain remission of sin. O, Lord! how dare these men, who deny that we obtain remission of sin through faith in Christ, call themselves Christians, or say that they have ever looked at or read the books of the Gospel? It is awful to a Christian even to hear this.

Secondly.—It is certain, that even those who are regenerated through faith and the Holy Spirit, are nevertheless not entirely pure, and do not keep the law perfectly, while this life continues. For, although they receive the first fruits of the Spirit, and though the new, yea eternal life has made a beginning in them, some portion of sin and evil desire still remains in them, and the law finds much whereof to accuse them. Hence, although love to God and good works shall and must dwell in Christians, still they are not justified before God

on account of such works of their own, but for the sake of Christ, through faith. Confidence in our own fulfilment of the law, is pure idolatry, even blasphemy against Christ, and it must finally fail and lead us to despair.

It must, therefore, stand as impregnable ground, that we become acceptable and just before God, for the sake of Christ, through faith, and not on account of our love and works. This we shall endeavor to set forth in a clear, positive, and tangible form.

While the heart has no peace with God, it cannot be just ; because it shrinks from the wrath of God, falls into despair, and feels unwilling that God should judge. Hence, the heart cannot be just and acceptable in the sight of God, because it is not at peace with him. Faith alone, then, pacifies the heart, which obtains rest and life, (Rom. 5, 1,) when it freely and confidently relies upon the promises of God, for Christ's sake. But our works can never pacify the heart ; for we continually find that they are impure ; consequently it must follow, that through faith alone we become acceptable to God and righteous, when we are satisfied in our hearts, that God will be merciful to us, not on account of our works and our fulfilment of the law, but by grace alone, for Christ's sake.

What can our opponents allege against this argument ? What can they contrive or devise in opposition to this manifest truth ? For it is undoubtedly true, and experience very forcibly teaches, that our works or worship cannot afford peace to our consciences, when we truly feel the judgment and wrath of God, or fall into temptation. The Scriptures abundantly confirm this, as in Psalm 143, 2 : "Enter not into judgment with thy servant : for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." Here the Psalmist clearly testifies, that all the saints, all the pious children of God, having the Holy Spirit, unless God remit their sins through grace, have sins still remaining in the flesh. When David says in another place : "Judge me, O Lord, according to my righteousness," (Psalm 7, 8,) he speaks of his cause, and not of his own righteousness ; but his prayer is, that God would protect his cause and his Word,—since he says : *Judge, Lord ! my cause.* Again, Psalm 130, 3, he clearly asserts, that no one, not even the greatest saint, can bear the judgment of God, if he would mark iniquities, saying : "If thou, Lord, shouldst mark iniquities, O Lord, who shall stand ?"

And thus Job says, 9, 28 : "I am afraid of all my sorrows, I know that thou wilt not hold me innocent." Again, verses 30, 31 : "If I wash myself with snow-water, and make my hands never so clean ; yet shalt thou plunge me in the ditch, and mine own clothes

shall abhor me." Again in the Proverbs of Solomon 20, 9: "Who can say, I have made my heart clean?" And 1 John 1, 8: "If we say that we have no sin, we deceive ourselves, and the truth is not in us."—Thus, in the Lord's prayer, even the saints pray—"Forgive us our debts," Matt. 6, 12; consequently they also are guilty and sinful. Again, Numb. 14, 18: "The Lord is long-suffering, and of great mercy, forgiving iniquity and transgression, and by no means clearing the guilty; visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation." Zachariah the prophet, 2, 13, says: "Be silent, O all flesh, before the Lord;" and Isaiah, 40, 6: "All flesh is grass,"—that is, the flesh and all the righteousness of which we are capable, cannot bear the judgment of God. And we find, Jonah 2, 8: "They that observe lying vanities forsake their own mercy." Wherefore mercy alone sustains us—our own works, merits, and power cannot help us.

These and similar declarations in the Scriptures, show that our works are impure, and that we need grace and mercy; therefore works do not afford the conscience peace, but mercy alone, which we apprehend through faith.

Thirdly.—Nevertheless Christ still remains the only Mediator and Conciliator, when we are thus born anew in him. Hence those are in error, who pretend that he acquires for us only *primam gratiam*, or the first grace, and that we must afterwards earn eternal life by our own works and merits. He remains the only Mediator, and we should entertain no doubt, that God is gracious to us for his sake alone, although we are even unworthy of it; as Paul says, Rom. 5, 2: "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand." Our best works, even after we receive the grace of the Gospel, (as we said,) are still imperfect. For sin and the fall of Adam are not so insignificant, as human reason supposes. The terrible wrath of God, entailed upon us by disobedience, exceeds the understanding and all the conceptions of man. A most fearful corruption has come upon the whole nature of man, which no power but God's can restore. The Psalmist therefore says, 32, 1: "Blessed is he whose transgression is forgiven." Hence we stand in need of grace, of God's merciful goodness, and the forgiveness of sins, though we have performed many good works. That grace, however, is obtained only through faith. Consequently Christ alone continues to be the High Priest and Mediator; and whatever good we may do, or to whatever extent we may keep the law, this does not please God in itself, but because we cleave to Christ, and are conscious that God is gracious to us, not for the sake of the law, but of Christ.

Fourthly.—If we should maintain the doctrine, that, after we receive the Gospel and are regenerated, we must merit the continued favor of God by our works, and not through faith, our conscience could not be pacified, but must despair. For the law continually accuses us, because we are unable to keep it perfectly, as the universal, holy, Christian church, and all the saints have ever acknowledged, and still acknowledge. Thus Paul says, Rom. 7, 19: "For the good that I would, I do not; but the evil which I would not, that I do," &c. Again, verse 25: "With the flesh I serve the law of sin." No one fears and loves God with his whole heart, as he is bound to do; no one bears the cross and affliction with entire submission to God; we all frequently doubt, in our weakness, whether God takes care of us, and regards us, and hears our prayers. We frequently murmur with impatience against God, when the ungodly prosper and the pious are afflicted. Again, who is it that performs his duty perfectly in his vocation, or who is not angry with God in temptations, when God withdraws himself? Who loves his neighbor as himself? Who is free from all manner of evil lusts? Of all these sins the Psalmist says, Psalm 32, 6: "For this shall every one, that is godly, pray unto thee in a time when thou mayest be found." Here he tells us, that all the saints must pray for the remission of sins.

Therefore, those are perfectly blind, who maintain that the evil desires in the flesh are not sins. Paul says of them, Gal. 5, 17: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh;" for the flesh places no confidence in God, relies on the world and temporal goods, seeks man's consolation and aid in afflictions, even against God's will, doubts his mercy and assistance, and murmurs against him in crosses and temptations; all this is against the commandments of God. The Holy Ghost contends and strives in the hearts of the saints, against the sin inherited from Adam, in order to remove and destroy the poison of the old Adamic nature,—the evil, desperate character of the heart,—and to produce in us another mind and disposition.

Augustine also says, "We keep all the commandments of God, when all is forgiven us that we do not keep." Hence he asserts that even the good works wrought in us by the Holy Spirit, are pleasing to God, only when we believe that he accepts us for Christ's sake, and not because they are in themselves worthy of his acceptance.

And Jerome says in opposition to Pelagius: "We are justified when we acknowledge ourselves to be sinners; and our righteous-

ness does not depend on our merit, but on the mercy of God." For this reason, though we abound in truly good works, and have thus begun to keep the law of God, like Paul when he preached faithfully, still we must have faith; we must trust that God is gracious and reconciled to us for Christ's sake, not on account of our works, because mercy cannot be embraced, except through faith alone. Those, therefore, who teach that we become acceptable to God on account of our works, and not for the sake of Christ, lead the conscience into despair.

From this it is sufficiently evident, that faith alone justifies us before God, that is, obtains grace and the remission of sins for the sake of Christ, and leads us to a new birth. Again, it is plain enough, that we receive the Holy Ghost through faith alone; that our works and our first efforts to keep the law, are not in themselves pleasing to God. We must therefore, although we abound in good works, like Paul and Peter, seek our righteousness elsewhere,—namely, in the promise of the grace of Christ. Moreover, as faith alone pacifies the conscience, it must follow that faith alone justifies us before God. For if we wish to teach the truth, we must always maintain that we become acceptable to God, not on account of the law, nor on account of works, but for the sake of Christ. Because the honor which belongs to Christ, should not be given to the law or to our miserable works.

Reply to the arguments of our opponents.

Having now set forth the true principles of this subject, namely, the difference between the law and the divine promises, it is easy to refute the objections of our opponents. They introduce passages relating to the law and good works; those, however, which speak of the promises of God, they omit. But to all their quotations concerning the law, it may be briefly replied, that the law cannot be kept without Christ; and although works, externally good, may be performed without Christ, still God has no pleasure, on that account, in the person performing them. Hence those teaching, or preaching of good works, should always add, that faith must precede, that God accepts them solely for the sake of faith in Christ, and that these works are fruits and testimonies of faith.

This doctrine which we maintain is very explicit, and will bear the light, and a comparison with the holy Scriptures. It is here also clearly and correctly presented to those who desire information, and do not wilfully deny the truth. In order properly to un-

derstand the benefits of Christ and the great treasure of the Gospel, (which Paul so highly extols,) it is necessary for us to separate, as far from each other as heaven and earth, the promises of God and the proffered grace, on the one hand, and the law on the other. A desperate cause requires many and various comments; but in a good cause, one or two thorough expositions generally solve all imagined objections. So in the case before us, this one solution explains all the passages which are quoted against us, namely, that no one can properly keep the law without Christ, and that, though external good works are performed, we are not acceptable to God without Christ; for we maintain that the Scriptures hold forth these two doctrines of the law and the promises of grace.

But our opponents without the least hesitation trample under their feet the whole Gospel, and all the promises of grace in Christ. Thus they teach, that we obtain the remission of sins on account of our love and works, and not through faith. For the grace and assistance of God must be very doubtful, if they depend on our works; because we can never be certain, when we have done enough, or whether the works are sufficiently holy and pure.

Consequently the forgiveness of sins would likewise be uncertain, and the promises of God would be destroyed, as Paul says, Rom. 4, 14: "If they which are of the law be heirs, faith is made void, and the promise made of none effect." We, therefore, teach the heart and conscience to comfort themselves with the promises of God, which remain firm, offering grace and the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, and not on account of our works.

Besides, we also teach in relation to good works and the law, not that we merit the remission of sins through the law, or that we are acceptable to God on account of the law, but that God would have good works. For we must (as Paul says, 2 Tim. 2, 15) rightly divide and separate the Word of God, the law on the one side, and the promises of God on the other. We must observe what the Scriptures say of the promises, and what of the law; for while the Scriptures enjoin and recommend good works, they exalt the promises of God, and Christ, the real treasure, many thousand times higher.

We should and must do good works, because God requires them; they are the fruits of faith, as Paul says to the Ephesians 2, 10: "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works." For this reason good works should follow faith, as thanksgivings to God; that our faith may be exercised, increased, and strengthened through them, and that others may be admonished by our profession and good deportment. Therefore Paul says, that Abraham received

circumcision, not that he might be justified on account of the work, but that he might have a sign on his body, to admonish him that he should ever increase in his faith, confess it to others, and incite them by his testimony to believe. Thus Abel made an acceptable sacrifice to God by faith, for the sacrifice did not please God, *ex opere operato*, but Abel felt assured that God was gracious to him, and performed the work for the purpose of exercising his faith, and inciting others by his example and profession to believe.

Now since good works ought to follow faith in this way, and in no other, those who do not believe that their sins are remitted unto them for the sake of Christ, without any merit of their own, perform their works with quite a different view. Because, when they see the good works of the saints, they judge the latter according to the manner of man, and imagine, that they have obtained the forgiveness of their sins, or that they were justified before God by their works. For this reason they imitate the saints in their works, thinking that they shall, in the same manner, obtain the remission of their sins and appease the wrath of God.

We condemn this manifest error and false doctrine concerning works: first, because, when we hold forth our works instead of Christ, as a treasure, as a reconciliation of the wrath of God, and as a compensation for sin, we deprive Christ, the true Mediator, of his honor, and give it to our feeble works: but the honor should belong solely to Christ, and not to our miserable works.

Secondly, the conscience cannot find peace in such works; for although men perform many good works, although they are zealous to do them, yet no work is so pure, important, or precious, as to propitiate God, or to secure eternal life, in short to give peace and joy to the conscience.

Thirdly, those who build upon their works, never become truly acquainted with God or his will; for he that doubts the grace of God, cannot believe that he will be heard, and as he cannot call upon God, he cannot realize divine assistance, nor learn to know God. But when we have faith, namely, the assurance that God is merciful to us through Christ, we can cheerfully call upon God, and learn to know him and his will.

The error, however, concerning works, elings closely to the world. The heathens also have sacrifices which came originally from the Patriarchs. These sacrifices and works of the Fathers they imitated, knowing nothing of faith, and believing, that these works would secure to them the grace of God. The Israelites also devised works and sacrifices, with a view to propitiate God by their *opus opera-*

tum; that is, by the mere work, without faith. We see how vehemently the Prophets reprov'd them, in the 50th Psalm, verse 8: "I will not reprove thee for thy sacrifices," &c. Again, Jeremiah says, 7, 22: "For I spoke not unto your fathers, concerning burnt offerings and sacrifices." Here the Prophets do not condemn the sacrifices as such, because God had commanded these as external exercises among his people; but they reprove especially their ungodly hearts, sacrificing as they did, with a view thus to reconcile God, *ex opere operato*, whereby faith was suppressed.

Now, as no work can give the conscience true peace, the hypocrites are wont, at a blind venture, to contrive work after work, and sacrifice after sacrifice, all without the word or command of God, and under the influence of an evil conscience, as we have seen in Popery. They are influenced principally by the examples of the saints; for when they imitate these examples, they think that they shall obtain the remission of their sins, as the saints did, &c.;—but the saints *believed*.

The children of Israel, seeing that the Prophets sacrificed in the high places and groves, imitated them for the purpose of appeasing the wrath of God by that work. But the Prophets made sacrifices at those places, not because they wished to merit the remission of their sins by these works, but because they preached and taught there. They offered these sacrifices, therefore, as an evidence of their faith.

Again, the people having heard that Abraham had offered up his son, offered up their sons too, in order that they might also do works afflictive and grievous to them. But Abraham did not offer up his son as a reconciliation, to justify him before God.

Thus Christ instituted the Eucharist in the church, offering therein the remission of sins through the divine promise, that we may be admonished, that our faith may be strengthened by the external sign, and that we may thus profess our faith before men, and exalt and preach the benefits of Christ; as Paul says, 1 Cor. 11, 26: "For as often as ye eat this bread and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come." Our adversaries contend, however, that the mass is a work, which justifies us in the sight of God, *ex opere operato*, and releases those from guilt and pain, for whom it is held.

Anthony, Bernard, Dominic, and other saints, by their particular mode of life, withdrew from society, that they might have a better opportunity to read the holy Scriptures, or for the sake of other exercises. Nevertheless they maintained that they were accounted just before God through faith in Christ, and that they obtained the grace of God through Christ alone. But the great mass

of people afterwards blindly rushed on, neglected faith in Christ, regarded only the example, without faith, and ventured to obtain the remission of their sins by these monastic works. Thus the reason of man always esteems good works too highly; and assigns them the wrong place. The Gospel opposes this error, and teaches that we are justified in the sight of God, not on account of the law or our works, but for the sake of Christ alone. No one, however, can embrace him, except through faith. Hence we also are justified before God, *through faith alone*.

In opposition to these views, our opponents quote the declaration of Paul, 1 Cor. 13, 2: "Though I have all faith, &c., and have not charity, I am nothing." Here they exultingly proclaim and boast, that they are assured by this passage that, not only faith, but love also, justifies us before God. But we shall find no difficulty in replying, inasmuch as we have shown above what views we entertain in relation to love and works. Paul means in this passage, that Christians should love their neighbors, and this we also assert. For we have already said, that when we are regenerated, we begin to keep the law and to obey the commandments of God. Hence, if any one neglects Christian love, he has become cold,—though he may have had strong faith,—he has become carnal minded, he is destitute of the Spirit and faith; because the Holy Spirit is not, where Christian love and other good fruits are wanting.

But it does not follow from this, that love justifies us before God; that is, that we therefore obtain the remission of our sins through love; that love overcomes the terrors of sin and death; that love should be set up against the wrath of God and his judgment, instead of Christ; that love fulfils the law; that we are reconciled and become acceptable to God through love, and not for the sake of Christ. Paul says nothing concerning all these things; and yet our opponents invent them.

For, if by our love we can overcome the wrath of God, and if we become acceptable to him by our fulfilment of the law, our adversaries may also assert, that the divine promises and the whole Gospel are of no account; because it teaches that we have access to God through Christ *alone*, and that we are not acceptable to God for our works of the law, but on account of Christ, as the only Mediator and Reconciler.

Our adversaries, by making additions, as in this place, explain many passages of Scripture according to their own opinions, and contrary to the true import. This passage is sufficiently clear, if they only cease adding their own dreams, which are not in the Scrip-

tures; for they do not understand what faith is, what Christ is, or how man is justified before God.

The Corinthians and others among them, had heard the Gospel, and received many excellent gifts; and, as is usually the case in matters of this kind, they were zealous and active in all things, in the beginning; but afterwards, when factions and sects arose among them, as Paul informs us, they began to scorn the true Apostles. Paul for this reason reproves them, and admonishes them to union and Christian love. Nor does he, in this place, speak of the remission of sins, or the manner of becoming just and righteous in the sight of God, or how a sinner is converted to Christ, or of love to God; but rather concerning the fruits of faith, and concerning love toward our neighbors.

Now it is most absurd to suppose, that the love we exercise on earth toward our neighbors, should justify us before God, when at the same time it is essential to that righteousness which avails in the sight of God, that we should obtain what will appease the wrath of God, and calm the conscience before him in heaven. None of these things can be effected through love, but through faith alone, by which we embrace Christ and the promises of God.

This is true, however, that he who loses love, loses also the Spirit and faith. Thus says Paul: *If I have not charity, I am nothing*; but he does not add the affirmative, that love justifies before God.

Yet they allege here, that love is preferred to faith and hope; for Paul says, 1 Cor. 13, 13: "The greatest of these is charity." Hence, they contend, that the virtue which Paul calls the greatest, justifies and sanctifies us in the sight of God. But in fact, Paul is here speaking of love to our neighbors, and *that love*, he says, *is the greatest*, because it extends far and produces much fruit upon earth. Faith and hope are exercised in reference to God alone, but love holds intercourse with men on earth, and effects much good, by consoling, instructing, and giving assistance and counsel, both privately and publicly. Yet we grant, that to love God and our neighbor is the greatest virtue, because it is the greatest commandment: "Thou shalt love the Lord, thy God, with all thy heart," &c., Matt. 22, 37, 38. It does not follow from this, however, that love justifies us.

But, *the greatest virtue*, say they, *must undoubtedly justify us*.

Reply.—It might be true, if God were gracious on account of our virtue. Now it was shown above, that we are justified and become acceptable, on account of Christ, and not for the sake of our virtue, because it is impure. Yea, while the commandment is the greatest, "Thou shalt love God," yet this virtue,—love to God,—

cannot justify us in the least. For as this law and virtue exceed our capacity, we are not justified on account of love. Faith, however, justifies us, not on account of our deeds, but solely because it seeks and receives mercy, and will not rely on our own works; that is, we teach that the law does not justify us, but the Gospel, which bids us to believe that God is merciful to us for Christ's sake, and not for the sake of our deeds.

Our adversaries, however, teach that love reconciles us to God, because they do not understand the Gospel, and regard nothing but the law, by which they wish to secure the grace of God on account of their own righteousness, and not through mercy for Christ's sake. Consequently, they must be teachers of the Law only, and not of the Gospel.

They also produce against us the declaration in Col. 3, 14: "Put on charity, which is the bond of perfectness." Hence they conclude that love justifies us in the sight of God, because it makes us perfect. We might here reply in various ways on the subject of perfection, but we shall be content with a simple exposition of Paul's declaration.

It is evident that Paul is speaking of love to our neighbors; hence no one has a right to think that Paul meant to say, that we should be justified before God, rather by the works of the second table than by those of the first. If, moreover, love is a perfection, or a perfect fulfilment of the law, there is no need of Christ the Mediator; but Paul teaches invariably, that we become acceptable to God for Christ's sake, not for the sake of our love, our works, or the law. Not even saints (as said above) fulfil the law perfectly. Now as Paul writes and teaches in every other place, that there is no perfection in our works during this life, it must not be imagined, that he spoke to the Colossians concerning personal perfection, but he referred to the *unity of the church*; and the word to which they attach the sense of perfection, signifies simply to be undivided or united. And his assertion, that *love is the bond of perfectness*, signifies that love binds, unites, and keeps together the different members of the church among themselves. For as union is preserved in a city or in a family, by the exercise of mutual forbearance, and as peace and tranquillity cannot continue, unless we frequently overlook each other's faults, and bear with one another; so Paul would exhort them to Christian love, patiently to bear each other's faults and imperfections, and to forgive one another, in order that unity might be preserved in the church, and that the mass of Christians might not be severed, separated, and divided into all manner of factions and sects;

from which great mischief, hatred, and envy, all manner of bitter feelings and evil passions, might arise, and finally public heresy. For union cannot continue, when the bishops unnecessarily impose upon the people burdens that are too heavy. And when the people are disposed hastily to pass severe judgment upon the whole walk and conduct of the bishops or preachers, or when they rashly become dissatisfied with their preacher, perhaps on account of some slight imperfection, factions will likewise be readily created, and it must result in great mischief; for in their bitterness, they will immediately seek other teachers and preachers.

Again, perfection and unity are maintained, that is, the church remains undivided and entire, when the strong exercise patience and forbearance towards the weak, when the people have patience with their preachers, and when the bishops and preachers, on their part, know how to excuse the infirmities and imperfections of the people, according to circumstances. Respecting this mode of maintaining union, much is said throughout the books of the philosophers and moralists. For we must forgive each other and excuse many things, for the sake of union. Of this Paul speaks in more than one place. Our adversaries are not right, therefore, in the conclusion that love must justify us before God; for Paul is not speaking here of personal perfection or holiness, as they imagine, but he says that *love creates peace and harmony in the church*. Thus Ambrose also explains this passage: "Precisely as an edifice is entire, when all its parts are connected," &c.

But it is a shame for our adversaries, that while they are writing and preaching so finely about love, and crying *love, love*, in all their books, they are manifesting none at all. What noble Christian love! to destroy the unity of the church, by their unheard of tyranny,—to attempt to influence his most gracious Majesty, the Emperor, to issue bloody edicts and promulgate cruel laws,—to murder priests and other pious, upright men, for no other reason, but simply for opposing manifest, infamous abuses! They desire the death of all those, who utter a single word against their ungodly doctrines. All this accords very imperfectly with their ostentatious display of love, of charity, &c. For if they had but a spark of love, peace and union might easily be secured in the church, provided they would not thus, in pure revengeful bitterness and pharisaic envy, defend their human traditions, (which are, at any rate, of no use to Christian doctrine or piety,) against the known truth, especially as even they themselves do not strictly observe their traditions.

They also produce the expression of the apostle Peter: "Charity

shall cover the multitude of sins," 1 Pet. 4, 8. Now it is evident, that Peter is here also speaking of love toward our neighbors; for he is dwelling in this passage upon the commandment of love, which requires us to love one another. Nor has it ever entered the thoughts of any Apostle, that love should overcome death or sin; or be a reconciliation, without Christ the Mediator; or be our righteousness, without Christ the Reconciler. Because love, though we possess it, is nothing more than legal righteousness; but it is far from being equivalent to Christ, through whom alone we are justified, when we believe that the Father is merciful to us for the Mediator's sake, whose merits are accounted to us. For this reason Peter previously admonishes us to adhere to Christ, and to be built on him as the corner-stone. He says: "He that believeth on him, shall not be confounded," 1 Pet. 2, 6. We shall be confounded, indeed, before the judgment seat and the face of God, with our works and conduct; but faith, through which we obtain Christ, releases us from these terrors of death, because we are perfectly assured by the promises, that our sins are remitted through Christ.

The language, 1 Peter 4, 8: "Charity shall cover the multitude of sins," &c., is quoted from the Proverbs of Solomon, where it is said: "Hatred stirreth up strifes: but love covereth all sins," Prov. 10, 12. Here the text itself clearly shows, that Solomon is speaking of love toward our neighbors, and not of the love we owe to God.

And he means the same thing that Paul does in the subsequent passage to the Colossians, namely, that we should endeavor to live kindly and brotherly, bearing patiently with one another, and avoiding disaffection and schisms; as if he would say, schisms grow out of hatred, as we see a great fire often arising from a small spark.

The difficulties between Julius Cæsar and Pompey were but small at first; and, had one yielded to the other, the great war would not have followed, in which there was so much blood-shed, so much misery and woe. But both of them being obstinate, unspeakable mischief and confusion in the whole Roman government of that time, resulted from it. Many heresies have also originated in the enmity of preachers against one another.

These words of Peter, "Love covers the multitude of sins," must therefore be understood in the sense, that love covers our neighbor's sins. Although differences arise among Christians, yet love bears all things, is willing to pass them by, yields to others, bears their faults with brotherly kindness, and is not censorious. Peter never meant to say, that love merits the remission of sins before God, that love reconciles us to God, without the mediation of Christ, or that

we become acceptable to God, through love, without Christ the Mediator. His meaning is, that he, in whom Christian love dwells, is not obstinate, overbearing, or unkind, but readily overlooks the imperfections and faults of his neighbor, forgives him in a brotherly spirit, makes peace, reproves *himself*, and yields for the sake of peace, as the Proverb says: *Amici vitia noris, non oderis*, that is, thou shouldst know the faults of a friend, but not hate him on their account.

And the Apostles did not without good reason exhort them to this love, which the philosophers call *επιφιλαν*; for if men are to dwell together in unity, whether it be in the church, or in temporal government, they must not weigh each others imperfections too rigorously, but let many of them pass by unnoticed, always bear with them, and as far as possible, have patience with each other in a brotherly spirit.

They also quote St. James, 2, 24, and say: "Ye see then how that by works a man is justified, and not by faith only." Now they imagine that this passage very forcibly opposes our doctrine; but if they only drop their wild conceits, and make no arbitrary additions, there will be no difficulty in replying. The words of the apostle James are explicit, but our adversaries add the fiction, that we merit the remission of sins by our works. Again, they pretend that good works are a reconciliation, through which we obtain the mercy of God: that we can overcome the great power of the devil, of death, and sin, by good works; and that our good works as such, are so acceptable to God, and so highly esteemed by him, that we have no need of Christ the Mediator. None of these views ever entered into the mind of the apostle James, though our adversaries undertake to maintain them by this declaration of the Apostle.

In the first place, then, we must observe that this passage is more against our opponents than in their favor. For they teach that men become godly and righteous before God, through love and works. They have nothing to say concerning faith, by which we cleave to Christ the Mediator; nay, they will have nothing to do with faith, and even attempt to suppress this doctrine of faith with sword and fire. James, however, pursues a different course; he does not omit faith, but speaks of it, thus recognizing Christ as the treasure and the Mediator, through whom we are justified before God. Thus Paul, when he lays down the substance of Christian faith, also connects faith and love, 1 Tim. 1, 5: "The end of the commandment is charity, out of a pure heart, and of good conscience, and of faith unfeigned."

In the second place, this subject itself shows, that James is speak-

ing of works which follow faith ; for he tells us, that faith must not be dead, but living, energetic, efficacious, and active in the heart. Hence it was not the meaning of James, that we merit grace or the remission of sins by our works ; because he is speaking of the works of those, who have already been justified through Christ, are reconciled to God, and have obtained the forgiveness of their sins through Christ. Our adversaries, therefore, are much mistaken in inferring from this passage, that by our good works we merit grace and the remission of sins ; or that James meant that we should have access to God through our works, without Christ the Mediator and Reconciler.

In the third place, St. James, speaking of spiritual regeneration before this, asserts that it is effected through the Gospel. He says, James 1, 18 : “ Of his own will begat he us with the word of truth, that we should be a kind of first-fruits of his creatures.” Now as he affirms that we are regenerated through the Gospel, he teaches that we are justified before God through faith. Because we take hold of the promises concerning Christ, through faith alone, when we are comforted by them against the terrors of death and sin. Hence, he did not mean that we should be regenerated through our works.

All this clearly shows, that this passage of James is not against us ; for in it he is censuring slothful Christians, who had become too secure in their minds, and imagined that they had faith, while they really had none. He therefore makes a difference between living and dead faith, calling faith dead, when it does not produce all manner of good works and fruits of the Spirit, obedience, patience, chastity, love, &c. ; but he calls that a living faith, which produces good fruits. Now we have frequently stated what we call faith ; not a mere knowledge of the history of Christ, which even devils have, but the new light and the power, which the Holy Ghost works in the heart, and through which we overcome the terrors of death, of sin, &c.

True Christian faith like this, is not so insignificant as our adversaries imagine, saying : faith ! faith ! how easy is it to believe ! Nor is it a thought of man, which he can produce in himself, but a divine power in the heart, through which we are regenerated, and by which we overcome the great power of Satan and of death, as Paul says, Col. 2, 12 : “ Wherein also ye are risen with him through the faith of the operation of God,” &c. This faith, because it is a new, divine light and life in the heart, through which we receive another mind and disposition, is living, efficacious, and abounds in good works.

It may therefore be said with propriety, that faith without works is not genuine. / And though he says that we are justified by faith and works, he does not maintain that we are regenerated through works, nor assert that we are reconciled by our works as well as by Christ, but he is describing how Christians should live, after they have been regenerated through the Gospel.

As he is speaking of works which are to follow faith, it is proper to say, that he, who has faith and good works, is just; yea, not on account of works, but for the sake of Christ through faith. As a good tree should bear good fruit, and yet the fruit does not make the tree good; so good works must follow the new birth, although they do not render man acceptable to God; but as the tree must first be good, so man must first become acceptable to God through faith, for Christ's sake. Our works are far too insignificant for God to be merciful to us on their account, unless he were gracious unto us for the sake of Christ.

Thus James is not opposed to St. Paul, nor does he say that we merit the remission of sins by our works, or that our works overcome the power of the devil, death, sin, and the terrors of hell, and are equal to the death of Christ. Neither does he say, that our works make us acceptable to God; or that they restore our hearts to peace, and overcome the wrath of God; or that works supersede the need of mercy. James asserts none of these things, and yet our opponents add them to his words.

They likewise produce still more passages against us; such as these:—In the 4th chapter of Daniel and the 27th verse, the text says: “Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor.” And Isa. 58, 7: “Deal thy bread to the hungry.” Again, Luke 6, 37: “Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven.” And Matt. 5, 7: “Blessed are the merciful: for they shall obtain mercy.”

We shall, in the first place, in regard to these and similar passages concerning works, reply that (as we have stated above) no one is able to keep the law without faith, and no one can therefore please God without faith in Christ, as he says, John 15, 5: “Without me ye can do nothing.” Again, Heb. 11, 6: “Without faith it is impossible to please him.” Again, as Paul says, Rom. 5, 2: “By whom also we have access by faith into his grace.” Consequently, when the Scriptures make mention of works, they invariably presuppose the Gospel concerning Christ and faith.

In the second place, nearly all the passages, now quoted from Daniel and others, were declarations concerning repentance. First,

they preach the law, point out sin, and exhort to reformation and good works. Secondly, there is, besides, a promise that God will be gracious. Now genuine repentance certainly requires, not only the preaching of the law, because the law only terrifies the conscience, but it requires the Gospel to be added, namely, that sin is forgiven for Christ's sake without merit,—that we obtain remission of sins through faith. This is so certain and clear, that if our adversaries assail it, and separate Christ and faith from repentance, they will be justly regarded as blasphemers of the Gospel and of Christ.

We ought, therefore, to apply these words of Daniel, the illustrious prophet, not merely to works—to alms—but we should also pay regard to faith. We must not regard the words of the Prophets, which were full of faith and spirit, in a heathen sense, as we would those of Aristotle, or some other heathen. Aristotle admonished Alexander not to employ his power to the gratification of his own arbitrary desires, but to the improvement of the country and of the people; this is proper and right; nor can any thing better be preached or written concerning the office of a king. But Daniel speaks to his king, not of his royal office alone; but of repentance, of the forgiveness of sins, of reconciliation to God, and of the exalted, important spiritual things, which far transcend all the conceptions and works of men. Hence, his words must not be referred only to works and alms, which even a hypocrite can perform, but *especially to faith*.

And it is evident from the text itself, that *faith* is meant in the case under consideration, namely, to believe that God forgives sins through mercy, and not for the sake of our merit. First, because there are two parts in the discourse of Daniel; the one is a declaration of the law and of punishment; the other is the promise or absolution. Now where there is a promise, faith is required; because the promise cannot be realized, except the heart rely on this word of God, without regard to its own worthiness or unworthiness. Consequently Daniel required faith also; for thus reads the promise: "Thy sins shall be healed." These words are a truly prophetic and evangelical declaration, because Daniel knew that through Christ,—the future seed,—the forgiveness of sins, grace, and eternal life were promised, not only to the Jews, but also to the Gentiles. Otherwise he could not thus have consoled the king. For it is not the work of man to give an alarmed conscience full assurance of the remission of sins, and to persuade it that God will no longer be angry, which requires evidence as to the will of God, from his Word. In this way Daniel knew and understood the great promises relative to the fu-

ture seed. Inasmuch, then, as he makes a promise, it is evident and clear that he requires the faith of which we are speaking.

But his declaration, "Break off thy sins by righteousness, and thine iniquities by showing mercy to the poor," is the substance of a whole discourse, and means *repent*. Besides it is true, that if we repent, we shall be redeemed from our sins; for this reason his expression is correct, *break off thy sins*. But it does not follow from this, that we are redeemed from our sins on account of our works, or that our works are a recompense for our sins. Nor does Daniel call for works only, but he says: "Break off thy sins by righteousness." Now it is universally known, that *righteousness* in the Scriptures does not mean external works merely, but it includes faith, as Paul says, Rom. 1, 17: "*Justus ex fide vivet*," "The just shall live by faith." Daniel, therefore, first requires faith, when he mentions righteousness, and says: *Break off thy sins by righteousness*, that is, by faith towards God, through which thou shalt be justified. In addition to this do good works also, namely, attend to thy office, be not a tyrant, but see that thy government be useful to the country and the people, maintain peace, and protect the poor against unjust power; these are princely alms, (*elemosynæ*).

Hence it is clear, that this passage is not opposed to the doctrine of faith. But our stupid adversaries add their appendages to all such passages, namely, that our sins are remitted for the sake of our works, and they teach us to rely on these works; yet these passages do not say this, but require good works, because indeed another and a better life must be wrought in us. These works, however, must not take the honor belonging to Christ.

In the same manner we may reply to the passage which is quoted from the Gospel: "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven," Luke 6, 37; for it involves the same doctrine concerning repentance. The first part of this passage requires a reformation and good works; the other part affixes the promise. But we must not infer from this, that our forgiving others, merits for us, *ex opere operato*, the remission of our sins. Because Christ does not assert this, but as in the sacraments he attaches the promise to the external signs; so also in this place, he attaches the promise concerning the remission of sins to the external good works. And as we do not obtain the forgiveness of sins in the Eucharist, without faith, *ex opere operato*, so we do not in this work and in our forgiving; for, to forgive others is no good work, unless God has previously forgiven our own sins in Christ. God must, therefore, forgive us, before our forgiveness of others can please him. For Christ was wont thus to con-

nect the law and the Gospel—faith and good works—in order to show, that there is no faith where good works do not follow ; and at the same time to furnish us with external signs, to remind us of the Gospel and the remission of sins, for our comfort ; thus to give full exercise to our faith.

Thus, then, such passages must be understood ; else they would be directly in opposition to the whole Gospel, and our beggarly works would take the place of Christ, who alone must be our reconciliation, and must not be contemned.

Again, if they were to be understood as relating to works, the forgiveness of sins would be altogether uncertain ; for it would rest on a loose foundation,—on our miserable works.

They also quote the passage, Tobit 4, 10: “Alms do deliver from death, and suffereth not to come into darkness.” We do not say that this is a *hyperbole*, although we would say so, in order to maintain the honor of Christ ; for it is his office alone, to redeem from sin and death. But we shall recur to our former rule, namely, that neither the law nor works, without Christ, justify man in the sight of God. Alms therefore (which follow faith) become pleasing to God only after we are reconciled through Christ, and not before. For this reason they do not deliver from death, *ex opere operato*, but, as we have stated above on the subject of repentance, faith must be connected with its fruits. Thus we may say of alms, that they please God, because they are given by believers. Tobit is speaking of faith as well as alms ; for he says, verse 19: “Bless the Lord thy God always, and desire of him that thy ways may be directed,” &c. Here he is in fact speaking of the faith to which we refer, which believes that God is gracious to us, and that we are bound to praise him for all his great goodness and mercy. To him this faith also daily looks for help, and prays him to guide us in life and in death.

In this sense we may grant, that alms are meritorious in the sight of God, but we cannot admit that they are able to overcome death, hell, the devil, and sin, or to give peace to the conscience, (for this must be effected solely through faith in Christ,) but they merit for us the protection of God against future evil and danger of body and soul. This is the simple meaning, and corresponds with other passages of Scripture. Because, when good works are commended in the Scriptures, we must always be governed by the principle of Paul, that the law and works must not be exalted above Christ, and that Christ and faith transcend all works as far as heaven is above the earth.

Moreover they cite the declaration of Christ, Luke 11, 41: "Give alms of such things as ye have; and behold, all things are clean unto you." Our adversaries being deaf, or dull of hearing, it is necessary for us frequently to repeat the rule, that the law without Christ justifies no one before God, and that no works are acceptable except for Christ's sake alone. Our opponents, however, exclude Christ on every side, act as though Christ were nothing, and impudently teach, that we obtain remission of sins through good works, &c.

But if we view this passage as a whole and in its connection, we shall find that it also speaks of faith. Christ reproves the Pharisees, because they imagined that they could become holy and pure before God by various *baptismata carnis*, that is, bodily baths, washings, and purifyings of the body, of vessels, and garments, even as one of the Popes has inserted in his canons, an important papistic clause concerning holy water, that, when besprinkled with consecrated salt, it sanctifies and purifies the people from sins; and the glossary says, that it purifies from daily sins. The Pharisees also entertained similar errors, which Christ reproved, proposing two kinds of purification, an internal and an external, instead of those they had devised, and admonished them to be pure inwardly. This is effected by faith, as Peter says in the Acts of the Apostles 15, 9. And Christ adds, with regard to external purity: "Give alms of such things as ye have, and behold all things are clean unto you."

Our adversaries do not correctly use the expression, *all things*; for Christ applies the conclusion to both propositions,—the internal purity and the external,—and says: *All things* are clean unto you; that is, when you not only bathe your bodies, but believe God and are inwardly clean, giving alms outwardly, all things are clean unto you. And he shows that true external purity consists in the works which God has commanded; not in human ordinances, such as those traditions of the Pharisees were, and as the sprinkling and besprinkling with holy water, the snow-white vestment of the monks, distinctions in meats, and the like, now are.

Our adversaries, however, sophistically apply this *signum universale*, general term, namely, the phrase, *all things*, to one part alone, and say: All things are clean unto you when you give alms, &c. It is like saying: "Andrew is here, therefore all the Apostles are here." In the antecedent or preceding part of this passage, both—believe and give alms—ought therefore to remain connected. For this is the object of the whole mission, the whole office of Christ; he came, that they might believe. Now when both parts are connected, faith and the giving of alms, it truly follows,

that all things are pure,—the heart by faith, the outward walk by good works. Thus we ought to connect the whole discourse, and not pervert the one part, and explain it as meaning that our hearts are cleansed from sin by our alms. Some think, that Christ here spoke ironically against the Pharisees, as if he would say: “Yes, gentle sirs, rob and steal, then go and give alms, you shall soon be pure;” they think that he reproved their Pharisaic hypocrisy with some degree of severity and scorn. For, although they were full of unbelief, avarice, and all manner of evil, yet they observed their purifications, gave alms, and imagined that they were very pure and perfect saints. This explanation is not repugnant to the text.

What reply is to be made in regard to other similar passages, can easily be inferred from those which we have explained. For this rule explains every passage relating to good works, and shows that apart from Christ they avail nothing in the sight of God, that the heart first needs Christ, and must believe that it is acceptable to God for the sake of Christ, and not on account of its own works.

Our adversaries also produce several arguments from the schools, to which it is easy to reply, when we know what faith is. Experienced Christians speak of faith far otherwise than the sophists do, as we have also shown above, namely, that to believe, is to trust in the mercy of God, that he will be gracious to us for the sake of Christ, without our merit; and this is believing the Article concerning the remission of sins. This faith is not a mere historical knowledge, for such the devils also have. The argument of the schools is therefore easily refuted when they say: “The devils also believe, therefore faith does not justify.” Yes, the devils have a historical knowledge, but they do not believe the remission of sins.

Again, they maintain, that to be just means to obey. “Now,” say they, “the performance of works is obedience; therefore works must justify.” To this we reply: righteousness is the obedience which God accepts as such. Now God will not accept our obedience in works as righteousness, because it is not sincere obedience, inasmuch as no one truly keeps the law. He has, therefore, ordained obedience of another kind, which he will accept as righteousness, namely, an acknowledgment of our disobedience, and confidence that we are acceptable to God for the sake of Christ, not on account of our obedience. Hence we may here say, that to be just is to be acceptable to God, not on account of our obedience, but through mercy for Christ’s sake.

Again, “It is sin to hate God; therefore, it must be righteousness to love God.” True, to love God is righteousness according to the

law; but no one fulfils this law. The Gospel, therefore, teaches a new righteousness, that we please God on account of Christ, although we do not fulfil the law; and yet, that we should begin to obey it.

Again, what is the difference between *faith* and *hope*? Reply: Hope awaits *future* blessings and deliverance from calamity; faith receives the *present* reconciliation, and is fully persuaded that God has forgiven our sins, and is now gracious to us. This is a noble worship of God, in which we serve him by giving him the honor, and holding his mercies and promises with such assurance, that we can receive and expect all manner of blessings from him, without merit. In this divine service the heart should be exercised and grow; but of this the ignorant sophists know nothing.

Hence it is easy to perceive, what we ought to hold in regard to *merito condigni*, respecting which our adversaries imagine, that we are justified before God by love and by our works, not even mentioning faith, but making our works, our fulfilment of the law, a substitute for Christ the Mediator. This is utterly inadmissible. For although we have stated above, that love certainly follows wherever the new birth has been effected through the Spirit and grace; yet the glory of Christ must not be transferred to our works; for it is certain, that both before as well as after them, provided we come to the Gospel, we are esteemed just for the sake of Christ, and he remains the Mediator and Conciliator before as well as after, and after as well as before them; yea, through Christ we have access to God, not because we have kept the law, and performed many good works, but because we so joyfully and confidently rely on grace, and so firmly trust that by grace we are esteemed just in the sight of God, for Christ's sake.

And the holy universal Christian church teaches, proclaims, and confesses, that we are saved through mercy; as we have shown above from Jerome. Our righteousness does not depend upon our own merit, but upon the mercy of God; and this mercy is apprehended through faith.

But here, let every intelligent reader observe, what would result from the doctrine of our adversaries. For if we maintain that Christ has merited for us only *primam gratiam*, that is, the first grace, (as they call it,) and that we must afterwards merit eternal life by our works, neither our hearts nor our consciences can be pacified, either in the hour of death or at any other time; nor can we ever build on sure ground, or know whether God is gracious to us. Thus their doctrine constantly leads the conscience to nothing but

grief, and finally to despair. For the law of God is not a jest ; it accuses us continually, when apart from Christ ; as Paul says, Rom. 4, 15 : " The law worketh wrath." Thus, then, when our consciences feel the judgment of God, and have no sure comfort, they fall into despair.

And Paul says : " Whatsoever is not of faith is sin," Rom. 14, 23. But those can do nothing in faith, who are to receive the grace of God, only after fulfilling the law with their works. For they will always waver, and doubt whether they have performed works enough, or whether perfect satisfaction has been rendered to the law ; Yea, they will forcibly feel, that they are still indebted to the law ; for this reason they can never feel assured that they have obtained the grace of God, or that their prayers are heard. Therefore they can never truly love God, nor can they expect any blessing from him, or serve him aright. For the soul, in which nothing but doubt, despondency, murmur, dissatisfaction, and hatred of God, dwell, is, indeed, hell itself. Yet in that hatred, they hypocritically call upon God, as did Saul, the ungodly king.

On this point we may appeal to the conscience of every Christian, and to all that have experienced temptations. They must acknowledge, that such uncertainty and disquietude, such torment and terror, despondency and despair, result from this doctrine of our adversaries, who teach or imagine, that by our works, or fulfilment of the law, we are justified before God. They direct us to a by-path, to our feeble works, instead of the rich, blissful promises of grace, made to us through Christ the Mediator.

The conclusion stands strong as a wall, yea, firm as a rock, that although we may have begun to do the law, yet we are not acceptable to God, and do not obtain peace with him on account of such works, but for the sake of Christ, through faith ; nor does God owe us eternal life for these works. For, even as remission of sins and righteousness are imputed to us for the sake of Christ, not on account of our works or the law ; so eternal life, together with righteousness, is offered on the same ground. Christ says, John 6, 40 : " This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life." Again, verse 57 : " He that believeth on me hath everlasting life."

Now we would ask our opponents, what advice they give to distressed souls in the hour of death : whether they encourage them to hope that they will fare well, be saved, and obtain the grace of God on account of their own merits, or by the grace and mercy of God for Christ's sake ? For St. Peter, St. Paul, and such saints, cannot

boast that God owes them eternal life for their martyrdom ; nor did they rely on their works, but on the mercy promised in Christ.

And it would be impossible for a saint, however great and exalted, to endure the accusations of the divine law, the great power of Satan, the terrors of death, and finally, the despair and fear of hell, without seizing hold of the divine promises, the Gospel, as of a tree or branch in the great flood, in the strong, violent stream, among the waves, the surges, and pangs of death ; or without holding by faith to the word which proclaims grace, and thus obtaining eternal life without any works, without the law, by grace alone. This doctrine alone supports the Christian in temptations and in the agonies of death,—a doctrine of which our adversaries know nothing, and speak as the blind do of colors.

But now they will say : “ If we are to be saved by mercy alone, what difference is there then between those that are saved, and those that are not ? If merit avails nothing, there is no difference between the wicked and the good, and it follows that they are alike saved.” This argument induced the schoolmen to invent the *meritum condigni*, because there must be a difference between those that are saved and those that are condemned.

In the first place, however, we assert, that eternal life belongs to those whom God regards as just, and when this is the case, they have become the children of God, and joint heirs with Christ ; as Paul says to the Romans, 8, 30 : “ Whom he justified, them he also glorified.” Hence none are saved, except those that believe the Gospel. But as our reconciliation with God would be doubtful, if it depended on our works and not upon the gracious promise of God, which cannot fail ; so also would all our hopes be doubtful, if they were based on our merit and works. For the law of God accuses us continually, and our hearts are sensible only of this voice from the cloud and the flame of fire, Deut. 5, 6, &c. : *I am the Lord thy God, this shalt thou do, thou owest this, this will I have thee do, &c.* No conscience can be at peace for a moment, when the law and Moses press upon the heart, before it embraces Christ by faith. Nor can it truly hope for eternal life, until it has obtained peace. For the doubting soul flees from God, falls into despair, and cannot hope. Now the hope of eternal life must be certain, and in order that it may not waver but be sure, we must believe that we receive eternal life, not through our works or merit, but by grace alone, through faith in Christ.

In temporal matters and worldly courts, there are found *mercy* and *justice*. Justice is made certain by the law and by judgment ;

mercy is precarious. With God, however, it is otherwise, because grace and mercy are promised by an indubitable word, and the Gospel is that word; it commands us to believe that God is gracious to us and will save us for Christ's sake, as we find John 3, 17, 18: "For God sent not his Son into the world to condemn the world; but that the world through him might be saved. He that believeth on him is not condemned," &c.

Whenever we speak of mercy, therefore, it must be understood, that faith is required; and this faith constitutes the difference between the saved and the damned, the worthy and the unworthy. Because eternal life is promised to none but those, who are reconciled in Christ. Now faith reconciles and justifies us in the sight of God, whenever we lay hold of the promise through faith. And during our whole life we should pray God and exert ourselves, that we may receive and increase in faith. For, as we said above, faith exists wherever there is repentance; but it is not in those who live after the flesh. This faith must also grow and increase during our whole life, amid various temptations. And they who obtain faith, are born anew, so that they also lead a new life, and do good works.

Now we say not only that true repentance must continue during the whole life, but also good works and the fruits of faith; although our works never become so precious, as to be equal to the treasure of Christ, or to merit eternal life; for Christ says, Luke 17, 10: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants." And St. Bernard correctly says: "You must necessarily first believe that you cannot receive the forgiveness of sins, except through the grace of God; and then, that you can have and do no good works, unless God grant them to you; and finally, that you cannot merit eternal life by any good works, even if it were not given to you without merit." And a little further on, he says: "Let no one deceive himself; for if you would properly consider the matter, you would undoubtedly discover that you cannot, with ten thousand, meet him who is advancing against you with twenty thousand," &c. These declarations of St. Bernard are certainly most emphatic: let them believe these, if they will not believe us.

Therefore, in order that the heart of man may enjoy true and infallible consolation and hope, we refer them, as Paul does, to the divine promise of grace in Christ; and teach them that they must believe, that God grants us eternal life, not on account of our works, or the fulfilment of the law, but for the sake of Christ: as the apos-

the John says in his 1 Epistle 5, 12: "He that hath the Son hath life; and he that hath not the Son of God hath not life."

In this matter our adversaries have eminently manifested their great skill, in perverting the declaration of Christ: "When ye shall have done all those things which are commanded you, say, We are unprofitable servants." They transfer this language from works to faith, saying: "Much more, are we unprofitable servants, when we believe all things." Verily! these are miserable sophists, perverting altogether the consolatory doctrine of faith. Say, ye dolts, how would you advise a dying man, who feels that he has no work that would be sufficient before the judgment-seat of God, and that he can depend on none? Would you also say to him: "Although you believe, yet you are an unprofitable servant, it will avail you nothing?" Surely the distressed conscience must fall into despair, when it knows not that the Gospel requires faith, for the very reason that we are unprofitable servants, and have no merit.

We should, therefore, beware of the sophists, who so blasphemously pervert the words of Christ. For it does not follow, that because works avail nothing, therefore faith also can not help us. We must give these rude dunces a common example:—It does not follow that if a farthing avails nothing, therefore a florin is of no account. As a florin is much more valuable and efficacious than a farthing, we must know that faith is much greater and more efficacious than works. Not that faith is efficacious on account of its worthiness, but because it relies on the promises and mercy of God. Faith is powerful, not on account of its worthiness, but because of the divine promises. Therefore Christ here forbids us to rely on our own works; for they cannot help. On the other hand, he does not forbid us to rely on the promises of God; nay, he requires this confidence in the promises of God, for the very reason that we are unprofitable servants, and that works cannot help us.

Hence, these deceivers are misapplying the words of Christ concerning reliance on our own worthiness, to confidence in the divine promises. This completely refutes and dissolves their sophistry. May Christ, the Lord, soon put to shame the sophists, who thus pervert his holy Word. Amen.

Our adversaries, however, attempt to show, that we merit eternal life by our works *de condigno*, on the ground that eternal life is called a *reward*. To this we shall briefly and correctly reply.

Paul calls eternal life a gift, (Rom. 6, 23,) because, when we are justified through faith, we become sons of God and joint heirs with Christ. But in another place it is written: "Your reward shall be

great" in heaven (Luke 6, 35,). Now if our adversaries think that these passages contradict each other, let them show it. But they do, as usual;—they omit the word *gift*, and everywhere pass by the chief point,—how we are justified before God. Again, they omit the doctrine, that Christ always remains the Mediator, and then wrest from its place, the word *merces* or reward, and explain it in the most artful manner, according to their own fancy, not only contrary to the Scriptures, but also to the usual mode of speaking; and they reason thus:—"Here the Scriptures say: *your reward*, &c., therefore our works are so worthy, that by them we merit eternal life." This is verily a new system of dialectics [a new mode of reasoning]; here we have the single word *reward*; therefore our works completely satisfy the law; therefore our works make us acceptable to God, and we have no need of grace, or of the Mediator, Christ; our good works are then the treasure, with which eternal life is bought and obtained. We can, therefore, keep the first and greatest commandment of God, and the whole law, by means of our good works. Besides, we can also perform *opera supererogationis*, that is, works of supererogation, or more than the law requires. Hence, if the monks perform more works than their duty requires, they possess supererogatory merits, which they may share with others, or give for money; and, as the modern gods, they can institute the new sacrament of donation, to show that they have sold and imparted their merits, as the Franciscan monks and other orders have shamelessly done, putting the caps of their orders even upon corpses. These are strong conclusions, indeed, all of which, it seems they can spin out of the single word *reward*, to the disparagement of Christ and faith.

We are not, however, contending about the word *reward*, but for great, exalted, and most important matters, namely, where Christians should seek true and certain consolation; whether our works can calm our consciences or give them peace; and whether we should hold that our works are worthy of eternal life, or whether it is granted for Christ's sake? These are the proper questions in this matter; and unless properly informed on these points, we can have no sure comfort.

But we have satisfactorily shown, that good works do not fulfil the law; that we need the mercy of God; that faith makes us acceptable to God; and that good works, however precious, though they were the works of St. Paul himself, cannot give peace to the soul. Hence we must believe that we obtain eternal life through Christ, by grace, not on account of works or the law.

But what shall we say concerning the reward which the Scriptures

mention? In the first place, if we should say that eternal life is called a reward, because it belongs to believers in Christ by reason of the divine promise, it would be perfectly correct. The Scriptures, however, call eternal life a reward, not that God is under obligation to grant it on account of our works, but that after eternal life is given otherwise, for other reasons, our works and tribulations are still recompensed, although the treasure is so great, that God can not owe it to us for our works; even as the son inherits all the goods of the father and they are a rich recompense and reward of his obedience; yet he receives the inheritance not on account of his merit, but because the father granted it to him, as a father, &c.

It suffices, then, that eternal life is called a reward, because it is a recompense for the afflictions which we endure, and the works of love which we do, although it is not merited by them. For there are two kinds of recompense, one is an obligation, the other is not; as, for instance, if the Emperor gives his servant a principality, the servant's labor is thus recompensed; yet the labor is not worth the principality, but the servant acknowledges it as a gratuity. So God does not owe us eternal life for our works; but yet, when he grants it for Christ's sake to believers, their afflictions and works are thereby recompensed.

We say, moreover, that good works are truly deserving and meritorious, not that they are to merit for us the remission of sins, or justify us before God; for they do not please him, unless performed by those whose sins are already forgiven. Nor are they worthy of eternal life. But they are meritorious with respect to other gifts, conferred in this life and in the life to come. For God withholds many gifts till yonder life, where hereafter he will raise the saints to honor; for in this life he would crucify and mortify the old Adam with all manner of temptations and afflictions.

And to this the declaration of Paul applies, 1 Cor. 3, 8: "Every man shall receive his own reward, according to his own labor." For the blessed will be rewarded, one higher than the other. Their merit makes such a difference, according as it pleases God; and it is merit, because such good works are performed by those, whom God has accepted as children and heirs; so that they have a special merit of their own, as some children have in preference to others. Our adversaries quote other passages also, to show that our works merit eternal life; such as these:—Paul says, Rom. 2, 6: "Who will render to every man according to his deeds." Again, John 5, 28, 29: "All that are in the graves shall hear his voice, and shall come forth; they that have done good unto the resurrection of life."

Again, Matt. 25, 35: "For I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat." Reply:—All these passages which commend works we must understand according to the principle which we have already laid down, namely, that works, apart from Christ, do not please God, and that we must by no means exclude Christ the Mediator. Therefore, when the text says, that eternal life is given to those who have done good, it declares that it is given to such as have previously been justified through faith in Christ. Because no good works are pleasing to God, unless accompanied by faith, through which they believe themselves to be acceptable to God for Christ's sake; and they who are thus justified by faith, will surely bring forth truly good works and good fruits; as the text says: "I was an hungered, and ye gave me meat." In view of this it must be acknowledged that Christ meant not only the works, but required also that we give him our hearts, and that we entertain just views concerning God, and believe that we are pleasing to him through mercy. Thus, Christ teaches that eternal life is given to the righteous, saying: "The righteous shall go into life eternal." And yet he previously mentions the fruits, that we may learn that righteousness and faith are not hypocrisy, but a new life in which good works must follow.

We are not here making unnecessary distinctions, but it is very important to have proper information on these points. For, the moment we grant to our adversaries, that works merit eternal life, they spin out of this the crude doctrine, that we are able to keep the law of God, that we need no mercy, and that we are just before God; that is, acceptable to God through our works, not for the sake of Christ,—and that we can do works of supererogation, yea, even more than the law requires. Thus, then, the whole doctrine of faith is entirely suppressed. But if the Christian church is to exist and continue, the pure doctrine concerning Christ and the righteousness of faith, must ever be maintained. We must therefore, oppose these great Pharisaical errors, in order to vindicate the name of Christ, his honor, and that of the Gospel, and to maintain for the hearts of Christians, true, constant, and unfailing consolation. For how can the heart or conscience possibly obtain peace or hope for salvation, when in temptations and in the pangs of death our works are altogether reduced to dust before the judgment and in the sight of God; unless it be assured through faith, that it is saved by grace for Christ's sake, not on account of our works, or our fulfilment of the law?

And surely St. Laurence, when lying on the flames, suffering as a martyr for the sake of Christ, did not believe that he thereby fulfilled the law of God perfectly and purely; that he was without

sin, and had no need of grace or of Christ the Mediator. He evidently rested satisfied with the words of the prophet David: "Enter not into judgment with thy servant," &c., Psalm 143, 2.

Nor does St. Bernard boast that his works were worthy of eternal life, when he says: "*Perdite vixi*, I have lived sinfully," &c. But he consoles himself by relying on the promises of grace; and believes that he has received the forgiveness of sins and eternal life on account of Christ; as the 32d Psalm says: "Blessed is the man unto whom the Lord imputeth not iniquity," verse 2; and Paul says, Rom. 4, 6: "Even as David describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." Thus, then, Paul says that he is blessed, to whom righteousness is imputed through faith in Christ, even without having performed good works. This is the true and enduring comfort, which will not fail us in our trials, and by which the soul can be strengthened and consoled; namely, that for Christ's sake, through faith, we receive the remission of sins, righteousness, and eternal life. Now when the passages which treat of works are understood as including faith also, they are by no means opposed to this doctrine. And faith must always be included, in order that Christ, the Mediator, be not excluded. But the fulfilment of the law follows faith, because the Holy Spirit, being present, effects a new life. This is sufficient in regard to this article.

ART. VII. AND VIII. (IV.)—OF THE CHURCH. pp. 349.

Our adversaries condemn the seventh article of our Confession, in which we say, that the Christian church is the congregation of saints. They talk at length to show, that the wicked or ungodly ought not to be separated from the church, because John the baptist compares the church to a floor, on which wheat and chaff are heaped together; and because Christ compares it to a net, containing fishes, both bad and good.

Here we have an illustration of the truth of the saying, that nothing can be so clearly expressed that an evil tongue cannot pervert. We have, for this very reason, added the eighth article, that no one might presume that we wish to separate the immoral and hypocrites from the external society of Christians or the church, or that in our opinion the sacraments, when administered by the ungodly, are without power or efficiency.

This false and erroneous construction, therefore, requires no long reply. The eighth article is our sufficient defence. We too confess

and declare, that hypocrites and wicked men may also be members of the church, in external communion of name and office, and that we may truly receive the sacraments even from wicked men, especially when they have not been excommunicated. The sacraments are not without power or efficacy, because administered by the ungodly. For Paul even prophesied, that Antichrist would sit in the temple of God, rule and reign in the church, have authority and hold office therein.

389.7
+
2170
The Christian church, however, consists not only in the communion of external signs, but chiefly in the internal communion of heavenly gifts in the heart; such as the Holy Spirit, faith, the fear and love of God. Nevertheless this church has external signs also, by which it is known; namely, where the pure Word of God is taught, and where the sacraments are administered in conformity with it, *there* in truth is the church, *there* are Christians. And this church alone is called in the Scriptures the Body of Christ; because Christ is its Head, and sanctifies and strengthens it through his Spirit; as Paul says, Eph. 1, 22, 23: "And gave him to be the head over all things to the church, which is his body, the fulness of him that filleth all in all." Therefore, they, in whom Christ effects nothing through his Spirit, are not members of Christ. Even our adversaries acknowledge, that the wicked are only dead members of the church.

I cannot find language, therefore, to express my astonishment, that they assail our definition of the church; for we spoke of its living members. Besides, we advanced nothing new. For Paul, Eph. 5, 25-27, gives the same definition of the church, and designates also the external signs, namely, the Gospel and the sacraments. For he says: "Christ also loved the church, and gave himself for it; that he might sanctify and cleanse it with the washing of water, by the word; that he might present it to himself a glorious church, not having spot, or wrinkle, or any such thing; but that it should be holy and without blemish." This passage of the Apostle we inserted almost literally in our Confession.

And in like manner we also confess in our Creed and holy Symbol: "I believe in a holy Christian church." Here we say that the church is holy. But the ungodly and the wicked cannot be the holy church. A little farther on we find in our Creed: "The communion of saints," which explains, even more clearly and explicitly, what the church is, namely, the body, the congregation, confessing one Gospel, having the same knowledge of Christ, and one Spirit that renovates, sanctifies, and rules their hearts.

And this article, concerning the catholic or universal church,

which is gathered from every nation under the sun, is very consolatory and highly necessary. But much greater, nay, almost innumerable is the mass of ungodly men who contemn, and bitterly hate, and violently persecute the Word of God; as for instance the Turks, the Mahometans, tyrants, heretics, &c. Moreover, the true doctrine and true church are frequently so completely oppressed and crushed, as for instance under Popery, that the church seems to be lost, nay, altogether destroyed. On the other hand, the consolatory article was inserted in the Symbol:—"I believe in a catholic, universal, Christian church," that we might be assured and not doubt, but firmly and fully believe, that there really is and will continue to be, a Christian church on earth, till the end of the world; that we may never doubt the existence on earth of a Christian church, which is the bride of Christ, although the ungodly predominate; and that here on earth, in the assembly which is called the church, Christ the Lord, daily operates, remits sins, constantly hears our prayers, and ever comforts his servants, in their trials, with rich and efficient consolation. This article was, moreover, designed to prevent any one from thinking, that the church, like any external government, is confined to this or that country, kingdom or state, as the Pope of Rome would have it; and it positively maintains, that the true church is the great body of true believers in all parts of the world, from the rising of the sun to his setting, who have but one Gospel, one Christ, the same Baptism and Holy Supper, and are ruled by one Holy Spirit; although they have different ceremonies.

It is also clearly stated in the explanation of the Decree of Gratian, that the word church, in its general sense, comprehends the bad and good; again, that the wicked are in the church only by name, not by practice; but the good are in it both by name and practice. And there are many passages in the writings of the Fathers of similar import. For Jerome says: "He that is a sinner, and still remains polluted with sin, cannot be called a member of the church, nor can he belong to the church of Christ."

Now although the wicked, and ungodly hypocrites, have fellowship with the true church in external signs, in name and office; yet, when we would strictly define, what the church is, we must speak of the church called the body of Christ, and having communion not only in external signs, but also holding faith and the gifts of the Holy Spirit in its bosom.

It is necessary for us, really to know, how we become members of Christ, and what constitutes us living members of the church; for if we should say that the church is only an outward government,

like other establishments, in which there are both wicked and pious men; no one would thus learn or understand, that the kingdom of Christ is spiritual, as it really is; that in it Christ inwardly rules, strengthens, and consoles the hearts, and imparts the Holy Spirit and various spiritual gifts; but men would think it an external form, a certain order of ceremonies, and worship.

Again, what difference would there be between the people of the law and those of the church, if the church were only an outward polity? Now Paul distinguishes the church from the Jews, Rom. 2, 28, 29, by saying that the church is a spiritual people; that is, a people distinguished from the Gentiles, not only in polity and civil affairs, but as the true people of God, enlightened in their hearts, and born anew through the Holy Spirit.

Again, among the Jewish people, all those who were native Jews and born of the seed of Abraham, had, besides the promises of divine blessings in Christ, many promises also concerning temporal blessings, respecting the kingdom, &c. And, on account of the divine promises, the wicked also among them, were called the people of God; for God, by these temporal promises, had separated from the Gentiles the lineal seed of Abraham and all that were native Jews; and yet the wicked and ungodly among them were not the true people of God; nor did they please him. The Gospel, however, which is preached in the church, brings not only the fore-shadow of eternal blessings; but each true Christian, here on earth, receives the blessings of heaven, eternal comfort and life, the Holy Spirit, and divine righteousness, until he shall be perfectly blessed in yonder world.

According to the Gospel, then, those alone are the people of God, who receive the spiritual blessings and the Holy Spirit; and this church is the kingdom of Christ, distinguished from the kingdom of Satan. For it is certain that all the ungodly are in the power of the devil, and members of his kingdom; as Paul says, Eph. 2, 2: "Ye walked according to the course of this world, according to the prince of the power of the air, the spirit that now worketh in the children of disobedience." Christ also said to the Pharisees (who were the holiest, and bore the name of the people and the church of God, and also made their offerings): "Ye are of your father the devil," John 8, 44.

The true church, therefore, is the kingdom of Christ; that is, the congregation of all saints; for the ungodly are not ruled by the Spirit of Christ. But what need is there of many words on a point so clear and manifest? Our adversaries, however, oppose the clear truth. If the church, which most assuredly is the kingdom of Christ

and of God, differs from the kingdom of the devil, the ungodly who are in the kingdom of the devil, surely cannot be the church; although, as the kingdom of Christ is not yet manifest, they are, in this life, among the true Christians and in the church, even as teachers and other officers. But the ungodly are not, in the meantime, on that account a part of the kingdom of Christ, since it is not yet manifest. For the true kingdom of Christ consists, and will continue to consist of those who are enlightened, strengthened, and ruled by the Spirit of God, although this kingdom is not yet manifest to the world, but concealed under afflictions, even as there is, and always will be, the same Christ that was once crucified, and now reigns and rules in everlasting glory in heaven.

This accords with the parable of Christ, where he distinctly says, Matt. 13, 38: "The good seed are the children of the kingdom; but the tares are the children of the wicked one: the field is the world,"—not the church.

This is also the sense of the words of John, Matt. 3, 12: "He will thoroughly purge his floor, and gather his wheat into the garner; but he will burn up the chaff with unquenchable fire." Here he refers to the whole Jewish people, and says, that the true church is to be separated from the people. This passage is rather against our adversaries, than in their favor; for it clearly shows, that the truly believing, spiritual people shall be separated from carnal Israel.

And when Christ says, Matt. 13, 47: "The kingdom of heaven is like unto a net;" and, it is "likened to ten virgins," Matt. 25, 1-5; he does not mean that the wicked are the church; but simply shows how the church appears in this world. He therefore says that the church is like these, &c; that is, as among a mass of fish, there are good and bad ones promiscuously; so the church here below is concealed among the great body and multitude of the ungodly; and he desires that the pious be not offended. Again, he would have us to know that the word and the sacraments are not without effect, although the ungodly preach, or administer them. Thus Christ teaches us, that the ungodly, though in the church according to external fellowship, are still not members of Christ, nor the true church; for they are members of the devil.

Nor are we speaking of an imaginary church, which may nowhere be found, but we affirm and know in truth, that this church containing saints, truly is and continues to be on earth; that is, there are children of God in different places throughout the world, in various kingdoms, islands, countries, and cities, from the rising to the setting of the sun, who truly know Christ and the Gospel; and we

assert that the external signs, the ministry, or the Gospel and the sacraments, are in this church.

This church properly is, as Paul says, (1 Tim. 3, 15,) *the pillar of truth*; because it retains the pure Gospel, the true foundation; and as he says, 1 Cor. 3, 11: "Other foundation can no man lay than that is laid, which is Jesus Christ." Upon this foundation the Christians are built.

True, among those who are built on the right foundation, that is, on Christ and faith, there are many weak men who build hay and stubble on such foundation, that is, certain human conceits and opinions, by which however they do not overthrow or reject Christ, the foundation. They are, nevertheless, Christians, and these faults will be forgiven them; they may also become enlightened and better informed. Thus even the Fathers sometimes built hay and stubble on that foundation; yet without intending to overthrow it.

But many of the articles of our adversaries subvert the right foundation, the knowledge of Christ and faith; for they reject and condemn our most important article, which declares, that we obtain remission of sins by faith alone, through Christ, without any works whatever. On the other hand, they teach us to rely on our works, by them to merit the forgiveness of our sins; and substitute their works, their orders, and the mass, for Christ; like the Jews, Gentiles, and Turks, they would be saved by their own works. They also teach, that the sacraments make men righteous, *ex opere operato*, without faith. Now he that does not consider faith to be necessary, has already lost Christ. Again, they establish the worship of saints, and call upon them as mediators, instead of Christ.

Now while God clearly promises in the Scriptures, that the church shall always have the Holy Spirit, he also earnestly warns us, that false teachers and wolves will insinuate themselves into the church, among the genuine ministers of the Gospel. But, properly speaking, the church which has the Holy Spirit, is the Christian church. The wolves and false teachers, however, are not the church, or the kingdom of Christ; although they rave in it and waste it; as Lyra says: "The true church does not rest upon the authority of prelates; because many of high rank, princes and bishops, as well as many of low estate, have fallen from faith. Therefore the church consists of those, who truly know Christ, and properly confess the faith and the truth."

In our Confession we say the same thing, in reality, that Lyra has stated, in the clearest possible terms. But our adversaries desire a new Romish definition of the church; they wish us to say:—

The church is the supreme monarchy, the greatest and most powerful sovereignty in the world, in which the Pope of Rome, as the head of the church, has the absolute control of all matters, great and small, spiritual and temporal. This power (however he may use or abuse it) no one dare dispute, or even whisper against. Again, in this church the Pope has authority to set up articles of faith; to establish various modes of worship; to abolish the holy Scriptures at pleasure; to pervert and explain them in opposition to all divine laws, to his own decretals, and to all imperial rights. Moreover, he has discretional authority to sell indulgences and dispensations for money; and from him the Roman emperor, all kings, princes, and potentates, are under obligation to receive their royal crowns, their sovereignty and titles, as from the vicar of Christ. The Pope is, therefore, a god on earth, a supreme ruler, the sovereign lord of all the world, over all kingdoms, all countries and people, over all possessions, spiritual and temporal, and thus controls all things, both the temporal and the spiritual sword. This definition, which does not at all accord with the true church, but very well agrees with the character of the Pope of Rome, we find not only in the Canonical Letters, but Daniel, the prophet also, thus describes Antichrist.

If we thus define the church as a system of pomp and pageantry, such as the Pope's, our judges would perhaps be more gracious. For the books of our adversaries are at hand, in which the power of the Pope is extolled in extravagant terms, yet no one opposes them. But *we* must suffer for praising and exalting the merits of Christ, for writing and preaching the plain word and doctrines of the Apostles, namely, that we obtain the remission of sins by faith in Jesus Christ, and not by hypocrisy, or invented forms of worship, such as the Pope has established without number. But Christ, the Prophets, and the Apostles, give a far different description of the church of Christ, wholly incompatible with the Pope's government.

Those passages, therefore, which refer to the true church, must not be applied to the popes or bishops, as if they were pillars of truth, and infallible. For how many among the bishops, popes, &c., are taking or have taken an earnest and sincere interest in the Gospel, or have considered it worth while properly to study a page or even a syllable of it? Many examples are, alas, at hand, which show that there are many in Italy and elsewhere, who laugh at all religion,—deride Christ and the Gospel, and publicly ridicule them. And if they assent to any thing at all, it is to that only which comports with human reason; all else they regard as fabulous.

Hence we draw the conclusion, according to the holy Scriptures,

that the true Christian church consists of all those throughout the world, who truly believe the Gospel of Christ, and have the Holy Spirit. And yet we acknowledge, that in this life, among true Christians, there are many hypocrites and wicked men, who are also members of the church, so far as it concerns external signs. For they hold offices in the church, preach, administer the sacraments, and bear the title and name of Christian. Nor are the sacraments, Baptism, &c., without efficacy, because administered by unworthy and ungodly men; for they stand before us by virtue of the call of the church, not on their own authority, but as representatives of Christ, who says, Luke 10, 16: "He that heareth you, heareth me." Thus Judas was also sent to preach. Now although ungodly men preach and administer the sacraments, they officiate in Christ's stead. And this declaration of Christ teaches us, that in such cases the unworthiness of the servant should not offend us.

But on this subject we have explicitly stated in our Confession, that we do not agree with the Donatists and Wickliffites, who held that those commit sin, who receive the sacraments in the church from ungodly ministers. This, we think, is sufficient to defend and sustain our definition of the church. And, since the true church is called in the Scriptures, the body of Christ, it is utterly impossible to speak of it otherwise than we have spoken.

It is certainly evident, that hypocrites and the ungodly cannot be the body of Christ, but belong to the kingdom of the devil, who has taken them captive, and rules them at pleasure. All this is indisputably clear. But if our adversaries still continue their calumniation, they shall be further replied to.

Our adversaries also condemn that part of the seventh article, in which we say, that it is sufficient for the unity of the church, to agree in the Gospel and in the administration of the sacraments, and that human ordinances need not every where be uniform. This they grant, so far as to say, that the unity of the church does not require special traditions [concerning rites and ceremonies,] (*traditiones particulares*) to be alike. But they maintain, that the true unity of the church calls for uniformity in general or universal traditions (*traditiones universales*).

This is a most awkward distinction. We say that those are one church who believe in one Christ, and have one Gospel, one Spirit, one faith, and the same sacraments; we are therefore speaking of spiritual unity, without which, faith and a Christian character cannot exist. This unity, then, we say, does not require human ordinances, whether universal or particular, to be every where alike.

For righteousness before God, which is brought by faith, does not depend on external ceremonies, or human ordinances, and faith is a light in the heart, which renovates and quickens it. To this work, external ordinances or ceremonies, whether universal or particular, contribute little or nothing.

And we had good cause for drawing up this article; for many great errors and foolish opinions concerning human traditions have crept into the church. Some imagined, that, without such human ordinances, Christian holiness and faith avail nothing in the sight of God; and that no one can be a Christian, unless he observe such traditions; while they are nothing but external ordinances, which often accidentally, or for certain reasons, differ in various places, as, in their worldly government, cities have different customs. We also read in history, that churches have excommunicated each other, on account of such ordinances, for instance, in regard to Easter day, images, and the like.

Hence the ignorant believed, that such ceremonies and services make us righteous before God, and that no one can be a Christian without them; for many absurd writings on this point, of the Summists and others, are still extant.

But we maintain, that the harmony of the church is no more broken by variations in such human ordinances, than it is by variations in the natural length of the day in different places. Yet we like to see the general ceremonies uniformly kept, for the sake of harmony and order, as in our churches, for instance, we celebrate the mass, the Lord's Day, and other great festivals.

We also approve all human ordinances, which are good and useful, especially those, which promote good external discipline among youth and the people generally. But the inquiry is not: shall human ordinances be observed on account of external discipline and tranquillity? The question is altogether different; it is: is the observance of such human ordinances, a divine service by which God is reconciled; and can we be righteous before God without such statutes? This is the chief inquiry, and when this shall have been finally answered, it will be easy to judge, whether the unity of the church requires uniformity in such ordinances.

Now if they are not necessary to serve God, it follows that we may be pious, holy, and just, be the children of God, and Christians, even without observing the same ceremonies that are in use in other churches. For example, if it be true that the wearing of German or French clothing is not a necessary service of God, it follows that some can be just and holy, and in the church of Christ, although

they do not wear German or French garments. Thus Paul clearly teaches Col. 2, 16, 17: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day, or of the new-moon, or of sabbath-days; which are a shadow of things to come; but the body is of Christ." Again, verses 20-23: "Wherefore, if ye be dead with Christ, from the rudiments of the world, why, as though living in the world, are ye subject to ordinances, (touch not; taste not; handle not; which all are to perish with the using,) after the commandments and doctrines of men? which things have indeed a show of wisdom in will-worship and humility, and neglecting of the body; not in any honor to the satisfying of the flesh."

The meaning of Paul is, that faith in the heart, through which we become righteous, is a spiritual thing, a light in the heart, through which we are renewed and receive another mind and disposition. But human traditions are not such a life-giving light and power of the Holy Spirit in the heart, they are not eternal; therefore they do not produce eternal life; they are only external, bodily exercises, which do not change the heart.

We cannot, therefore, believe, that they are necessary to righteousness before God. In this sense Paul says to the Romans, 14, 17: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink: but righteousness and peace, and joy in the Holy Ghost." But it is unnecessary here to quote many passages of Scripture, as the Bible is full of such, and we have adduced many of them in the last article of our Confession. We shall hereafter dwell more particularly on the chief question of this subject, namely, whether such human ordinances are a divine service necessary to salvation. Then we shall speak more fully on this subject.

Our adversaries say that we must observe such ordinances, especially the universal ceremonies, because it is probable that they were handed down to us from the Apostles. What great, holy, eminent, apostolic men! how pious and spiritual they have now become! They are willing to observe the ordinances and ceremonies, established, as they say, by the Apostles; but not willing to follow the doctrines and clear words of the Apostles. But we say and know, that it is right, concerning all ordinances, to entertain and express the same views that the Apostles themselves advanced in their writings; and they every where contend, most vigorously and earnestly, not only against those who would exalt human ordinances, but those also, who are disposed to regard the divine law, the ceremonies of circumcision, &c. as necessary to salvation.

The Apostles were far from desiring thus to burden the conscience, by preaching, that it would be sinful not to observe such

ordinances concerning certain days, fasts, meats, and the like. Moreover, Paul (1 Tim. 4, 1,) plainly calls such teaching the *doctrines of devils*. What the views of the Apostles were in this matter, must therefore be ascertained from their clear writings: it is not sufficient to give mere illustrations. True, they observed certain days; not because this was necessary in order to become righteous before God, but that the people might know when to come together. They also observed various customs and ceremonies, such as reading regular lessons in the Bible, convening at stated periods, &c. In the beginning of the church also, the Jews, who had become Christians, retained many of their Jewish festivals and ceremonies, which the Apostles then adapted to the Gospel history. So our Easter and Whitsuntide were derived from their Passover and Pentecost. The Apostles wished, not only by teaching, but also by such historical festivals, to transmit to posterity a knowledge of Christ and the great Gospel treasure. Now if such ceremonies are necessary to salvation, why then did the bishops afterwards introduce many changes in them? If they were instituted by the command of God, no man had power to alter them.

Before the Council of Nice, Easter was observed in different places at different times, but this want of uniformity did not in the least injure the faith or Christian unity. Afterwards Easter was intentionally changed, so as not to fall on the same day with the Passover. But the Apostles enjoined the keeping of Easter in the churches at the time, when the brethren, who were converted from Judaism, observed it. Some bishoprics and people, therefore, even after the Council of Nice, strongly insisted, that Easter, should be observed at the time of the Passover. But the Apostles did not intend by their decree to impose such a burden upon the churches as necessary to salvation, which the decree itself clearly shows; for they distinctly say, that no one should trouble himself about the brethren, who keep Easter, &c., although they may not exactly compute the time. For Epiphanius refers to the words of the Apostles, from which every intelligent man may clearly perceive, that the Apostles wished to turn the people from the error of making holidays, certain seasons, &c., matters of conscience. Indeed, they expressly add that no one should be much concerned, though there be an error in the computation of Easter. I could produce a mass of such testimony from history, and show still more clearly that such difference in external ordinances, separates no one from the universal Christian church.

Our adversaries, who teach that the unity of the Christian church consists in ordinances relating to meats, days, vestments, and the

like, which God has not enjoined, by no means understand what faith, or what the kingdom of Christ is. In this matter every one may perceive what pious and exceedingly holy people our adversaries are. For, if universal ordinances are necessary, and if they should never be altered, who authorized them to alter the order of the Lord's Supper? which is not a human ordinance, but a divine institution. We shall, however, especially treat of this subject hereafter.

Our opponents approve the whole of the eighth article, in which we say, that hypocrites and ungodly men are found in the church, and that the sacraments are not inefficacious, although administered by hypocrites; because they are administered by these men instead of Christ, and not on their own authority, according to Luke 10, 16: "He that heareth you, heareth me." Yet we ought not to receive or hear *false* teachers, because they are not in Christ's stead, but are "Antichrists." In regard to these, Christ clearly commanded, Matt. 7, 15: "Beware of false prophets;" and Paul says, Gal. 1, 8: "Though we or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

Moreover, with respect to the lives of the priests themselves, Christ admonishes us in the parables concerning the church, not to create schisms, as did the Donatists, when the priests or the people do not every where live a pure and Christian life. Those, however, who excited schisms in some places, on the ground that it is not lawful for priests to have possession or property, we regard as seditious; for the possession of property or goods is a temporal regulation, and Christians may employ all kinds of temporal regulations as freely as they use air, food, drink, and common light. For even as heaven and earth, the sun, moon, and stars, are ordained and preserved by God; so systems of government and every thing belonging to them, are God's ordinances, and preserved and protected by him against the devil.

Of Baptism.

Our opponents also agree to the ninth article, in which we confess that Baptism is necessary to salvation, and that the baptism of infants is not fruitless, but necessary and salutary. And as the Gospel is preached in its purity and with all diligence among us, we have enjoyed (God be praised) a great benefit and blessed fruit, because the Anabaptists have gained no ground in our churches. We praise God, that our people are fortified by his Word against the

ungodly, riotous mobs of these vile men; and while we have put down and condemned many other errors of the Anabaptists, we have especially contended for, and maintained against them, the blessings of infant baptism.

For it is altogether certain that the divine promises of grace and of the Holy Spirit, belong not only to adults, but also to children. Now, the promises do not apply to those that are out of the church of Christ, where there is no Gospel nor sacrament. For the kingdom of Christ exists only, where the Word of God and the sacraments are found.

It is, therefore, a truly Christian and necessary practice, to baptize children, in order that they may become participants of the Gospel, the promise of salvation and grace, as Christ commands, Matt. 28, 19: "Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them," &c. Now, as grace and salvation in Christ are offered to all, so baptism is offered, both to men and women, to youths and infants. Hence it certainly follows that we may and should baptize infants; for in and with baptism, universal grace and the treasure of the Gospel are offered to them.

In the second place, it is clear that the Lord God approves the baptism of young children. The Anabaptists, who condemn such baptism, therefore teach false doctrine. But it is manifest that God approves the baptism of young children, from the fact that he gave the Holy Spirit to many who were baptized in their infancy; for there have been many holy men in the church, and they were not baptized otherwise.

Our adversaries do not object to the tenth article, in which we confess that the body and blood of Christ our Lord, are truly present in the holy Supper, and there administered and received with the visible elements, the bread and wine, as hitherto maintained in the church, and as the Greek Canon shows. And Cyril tells us, that Christ is corporeally administered and given to us in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for he says: "We do not deny that, by true faith and pure love, we are spiritually united with Christ. But that we should have no union at all with him according to the flesh, we certainly deny; besides, it is also utterly repugnant to the Scriptures. For who will doubt that Christ is even thus the vine, and that we are the branches that receive nourishment and life from him? Hear Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 16, 17: 'For we being many are one bread, and one body: for we are all partakers of that one bread.' Think you, that the power of the divine blessing in the Eucharist is unknown to us? For when we receive it, the consequence is, that

Christ even dwells in us bodily, through the participation of his flesh and body. Again, hence it is to be observed that Christ is in us, not only by spiritual union, through love, but also by natural communion." And we are speaking of the presence of the living body; for we know, as Paul says, Rom. 6, 9, that "Death hath no more dominion over him."

Our adversaries approve the eleventh article, in which we speak of absolution. But, in relation to confession they add, that every Christian should confess once every year, according to the chapter: *Omnis utriusque sexus*; and though he cannot fully enumerate all his sins, yet he should exert himself to recollect all of them, and state in confession as many as he can remember.

We shall hereafter continue our remarks on this whole article, when we come to speak of Christian repentance. It is well known, and our adversaries cannot deny, that the doctrines advanced by our divines on the subject of absolution and the keys, are so thoroughly Christian, so judicious and pure, that many afflicted souls derive great consolation therefrom, after receiving proper instructions on this vital subject; namely, that it is the command of God and the proper use of the Gospel, to believe the absolution of our sins, and to be assured that they are forgiven us without any merit of our own, through Christ, and that, when we believe the words of absolution, we are as surely reconciled to God, as if we heard a voice from heaven.

This doctrine, which is indispensably necessary, has afforded great consolation to afflicted minds. Many upright, intelligent, and pious men, in the very beginning, highly commended Dr. Luther, on account of our doctrine; and they were much gratified to see the sure consolation which we need restored to light. For the important doctrine of repentance and absolution had been wholly suppressed, when the sophists no longer presented true and constant consolation to the conscience, but directed men to their own works, which produce nothing but despair in the alarmed conscience.

But with respect to the time of confession, it is a fact, and known to our adversaries, that many in our churches make confession not only once a year, but often, and attend to absolution and the holy Supper. And our ministers, when they treat of the use and the blessings of the holy sacraments, carefully teach and admonish the people frequently to attend the holy Supper. Besides the works of our divines are well known, and so written that the honorable and pious among our adversaries must approve and commend them.

It is likewise always announced by our pastors, that all those who

live in open vice, in fornication, adultery, &c., and those who scorn the holy sacraments, shall be excommunicated and excluded. In this we therefore follow the Gospel and the ancient canons.

No one, however, is compelled to receive the Sacrament on a particular day, or at a fixed time; for it is impossible for all to be equally prepared at a fixed time; and if all the people in a whole parish were to approach the altar at one time, they could not be examined and instructed with the same diligence, with which this is now done among us. And the ancient canons and the Fathers have prescribed no particular time. The canon says only: "If any go to the church, and it is found that they do not commune, they shall be admonished. Those that do not commune, shall be admonished to repentance. If they wish to be regarded as Christians, they must not always abstain from it."

Paul, 1 Cor. 11, 29, says: "He that eateth and drinketh unworthily, eateth and drinketh damnation to himself." Our ministers therefore do not urge those to receive the Sacrament, who are unprepared.

But as to the recollection and enumeration of sins in confession, our ministers do not ensnare the souls of men, by requiring them to specify all their sins. Although it has a good effect to accustom rude and inexperienced persons to specify in confession some of the sins which trouble them, in order that they may more easily be instructed; yet that is not the question now, but whether God has commanded us thus to enumerate all our sins; and whether those, which are not enumerated, cannot be forgiven?

Our adversaries, therefore, should not have quoted against us the chapter: *Omnis utriusque sexus*, which is well known to us. They should rather have shown us from the holy Scriptures, from the Word of God, that God has commanded such an enumeration of sins.

It is, alas! but too evident and notorious in all the church throughout Europe, how this part of the chapter—*Omnis utriusque sexus*—which requires all to confess all their sins, has thrown the conscience into misery, distress, and snares. But the text itself has not done as much harm as the books of the Summists, in which the particular circumstances of sins are collected, have since done. For thus especially did they involve the conscience in great perplexity and unspeakable torment; and this affected none but good men; for the impudent and dissolute cared but little about it.

The text says, that each one must confess to his own priest. Now, what great strife, what deadly envy and hatred, were excited between the clergymen and the monks of various orders, in determin-

ing the question: which is the proper priest? All brotherly love and friendship ceased, when power or the confessor's fees were concerned.

We therefore maintain, that God did not command that our sins should be enumerated and specified. Panormitan, and many other learned men, entertained the same views. We would not burden the conscience with the chapter: *Omnis utriusque sexus*; but with regard to it, as of other human ordinances, we say that it is not a divine service, necessary to salvation. Besides, this chapter commands an impossibility, namely, that we must confess all our sins. Now, it is certain, that there are many sins which we cannot remember, and some of the greatest even we do not see; as the Psalmist, 19, 12, says: "Who can understand his errors?"

Intelligent and pious pastors well know how far it may be necessary and useful, to question the young and ignorant in confession. But we neither can nor will approve the tyranny, which the Summists, like jailors, exercise over the conscience, tormenting it continually; and which would not have been so severe, if they had said but a single word concerning faith in Christ, which truly consoles the conscience.

But in their many large collections of Decretals, Commentaries, Summaries, and Confessions, there is not a word or tittle concerning Christ, faith, and the remission of sins. Not a word can be found there, teaching Christ, or what he is; but our adversaries are occupied with these registers only in order to collect sins, and increase their number. Now this might be well enough, if they had but a proper conception of the sins, which God regards as such. The greater portion of their summaries, however, is taken up with foolishness and human ordinances. O! how many pious souls, willing to do right, were driven to despair, and deprived of their rest, by this wicked and ungodly doctrine; for they knew no better, and thought they must thus torment themselves with enumerating and adding their sins together; and yet they found that this was impossible, and ever brought disquietude. But our adversaries have taught errors equally great on the whole subject of repentance, which we shall hereafter state.

V. OF REPENTANCE.

Our adversaries approve the first part of the twelfth article, in which we assert that all those who fall into sin after baptism, obtain the remission of sins, whenever, and as often as they repent.

They condemn and reject the other part, however, in which we declare that repentance consists of two parts,—contrition, and faith; that is, it includes a penitent, contrite heart, and the faith that we obtain the remission of sins through Christ.

Observe here, then, what our adversaries deny. They have the impudence to deny, that faith is a part of repentance. Now, what shall we do, most gracious Emperor, in such a case? We surely obtain the remission of our sins through faith. This declaration is not ours, but it is the voice and word of Jesus Christ our Savior.

The writers of the Confutation condemn this clear declaration of Christ; therefore we can in no way assent to the Confutation. If it please God, we will not deny the clear words of the Gospel, the holy divine truth, and the blessed Word, in which all our consolation and our salvation rest. For thus to deny that we obtain the remission of sins by faith, would be to revile and blaspheme the blood and death of Christ.

We therefore entreat your Imperial Majesty, graciously and attentively to hear and recognize us, on this great, important, and most weighty subject, which concerns our own souls and consciences, the whole Christian faith, the whole Gospel, the knowledge of Christ, and our highest and greatest interests: not only in this transitory life, but also in the future, yea, our eternal salvation and perdition before God. All pious and upright men shall discover, that we have taught and caused to be taught nothing but the divine truth on this subject, and have given nothing but wholesome, necessary, and consolatory instruction. In this doctrine all pious hearts, in the whole Christian church are most deeply interested; yea, it involves entirely their salvation and happiness; without such instruction, no ministry or Christian church can exist.

All godly men will find, that our doctrine concerning repentance has again brought to light the Gospel and its true meaning, and that it has removed many pernicious and odious errors, while the writings of the Scholastics and Canonists had entirely suppressed this doctrine of true repentance. We shall now show this, before we enter upon the subject. All honorable, honest, and intelligent men of every order, even the theologians, must confess, and no doubt our enemies themselves are convinced in their own minds, that before Dr. Luther wrote, we had none but obscure and confused treatises on the subject of repentance: as may be seen in the writings of the Sententiaries, in which there is an infinite number of useless questions, which no theologian has ever been able to explain satisfactorily. Much less could the people learn, from these sermons and confused

writings what the substance of repentance is, or what are the principal parts of true repentance, and how the soul must seek rest and peace; and we venture to say that no one can learn from their books, when his sins are truly forgiven.

Great God! what blindness! What consummate ignorance on this subject! Their writings are nothing but darkness and obscurity. They raise questions: Whether the forgiveness of sins takes place in *attrition* or *contrition*;—"If sin is forgiven on account of penitence or contrition, what is the use of absolution? If sin be already forgiven, what need of the power of the keys?" With these things they trouble and perplex themselves, and entirely destroy the power of the keys. Some of them pretend that guilt is not forgiven before God, by the power of the keys, but that *eternal* is thus converted into *temporal* punishment; thus making absolution and the power of the keys, from which we are to expect consolation and life, a power simply to impose punishment on us. Others who would be more skilful, say that through the power of the keys sins are forgiven before men, or before the Christian congregation, but not before God.

This is also a most pernicious error; for if the power of the keys, which God has given, does not console us before him, how is the conscience to obtain peace? They, moreover, teach things even more ill-judged and confused; they say that men can merit grace by contrition. Now if they were asked why Saul and Judas, and like individuals, who were very contrite, did not merit grace, they would have to reply, that in Judas and Saul there was a want of the Gospel and of faith, that Judas did not console himself with the Gospel and believe; for faith distinguishes the contrition of Peter from that of Judas.

Our adversaries, however, never mention faith and the Gospel, but appeal to the law, saying, Judas did not love God, but dreaded punishment. Is not this a loose and improper representation of repentance? For when can the alarmed conscience know, especially in the serious and great terrors, described in the Psalms and the writings of the Prophets, whether we fear God out of love, as our God, or whether we dread his wrath and eternal condemnation?

They can have experienced but little of these great terrors, quibbling as they do, and making distinctions according to their fancies, but in the heart and in actual experience it is far otherwise. No conscience can be pacified with mere words and sounds, as these bland and idle sophists dream. We appeal to the experience of all pious men, all that are honest and intelligent, and desire to know

the truth, will confess that in all their books, our adversaries give no correct and satisfactory exposition of repentance, but mere confused, idle talk; and yet repentance and the remission of sins are most important articles of Christian doctrine.

Now their doctrines on the above questions are full of error and hypocrisy, suppressing the true doctrine of Christ, of the power of the keys, and of faith, to the unspeakable injury of souls.

Further, on the subject of confession, they propagate more errors still; all they teach is, to enumerate and make long lists of sins, mostly sins against human commands; and they urge these things upon the people, as if they were *de jure divino*, that is, by divine right, or commanded of God. But even this would not have been so very oppressive, if they had only taught the truth concerning absolution and faith. But these also they pass by, taking no notice of the consolation they afford, and setting up the fiction that the work itself, confession and contrition, makes the soul righteous, *ex opere operato*, without Christ and without faith. They are veritable Jews.

The third part of this subject is *satisfaction*, or the atonement for sin. On this point their teachings are still more bungling and confused: they present such a perfect medley, that the poor conscience cannot there obtain the least of the true consolation it needs. They invent the fancy, that eternal punishment is changed before God into the punishment of purgatory; that a part of the punishment is forgiven and remitted through the [power of the] keys, but a part must be atoned for by works. They moreover call the *opera supererogationis*, atonements: these are their puerile and foolish works—pilgrimages, rosaries, and the like, which are not commanded of God.

Moreover, as they would redeem themselves from the pains of purgatory by an atonement of their own, so they invented an additional scheme of redemption from this atonement itself, which finally became a very profitable speculation, and resembled a great annual fair. Shamelessly selling their indulgences, they asserted that all who procured them were released from rendering satisfaction. This traffic they unblushingly carried so far, as not only to sell indulgences to the living, but also to require them for the dead. Besides, they also introduced the monstrous abuse of the mass, pretending by it to redeem the dead. Under such doctrines of the devil, the whole Christian doctrine concerning faith and Christ, and the consolation it affords us, lay buried.

Hence all honest, upright, honorable, and intelligent men, to say nothing of Christians, perceive that it was urgently necessary to condemn this ungodly doctrine of the sophists and Canonists on the

subject of repentance, for it is manifestly false, wrong, contrary to the clear words of Christ, to all the writings of the Apostles, to all the Scriptures, and to the Fathers. Their errors are:

I. That God must forgive us our sins, if we do good works even without grace.

II. That we merit grace by attrition or contrition.

III. That, to blot out our sins, it is sufficient to hate and reprove them.

IV. That we obtain the remission of sins by our contrition, not by faith in Christ.

V. That the power of the keys confers the remission of sins, not before God, but before the church or men.

VI. That the power of the keys not only forgives sins, but was instituted to convert eternal into temporal punishment, to impose certain acts of expiation upon the conscience, and to establish forms of divine service and expiatory works, to which to bind the conscience before God.

VII. That the enumeration, and actual specification of all sins, are commanded of God.

VIII. That acts of atonement (*satisfactiones*), which are established by man, are necessary to the expiation of punishment, or are even a compensation for guilt. For, although in the schools the *satisfactiones* are set off only for the punishment, yet they are universally understood as meriting the forgiveness of guilt.

IX. That through the reception of the sacrament of repentance, although the heart be not engaged therein, we obtain grace, *ex opere operato*, without faith in Christ.

X. That by virtue of the power of the keys, souls are released from purgatory, by means of indulgences.

XI. That in reserved cases not only the canonical punishment, but even the guilt of sin before God can be retained, by the Pope, in those who are truly converted to God.

Now in order to extricate the conscience from the innumerable snares and complicated nets of the sophists, we assert that repentance or conversion consists of two parts, contrition and faith. If any one, however, feels disposed to add, as a third part, the fruits of repentance and conversion, which are good works, and which shall and must follow, we shall not seriously object. But when we speak *de contritione*, that is, concerning true contrition, we cut off their innumerable and useless questions, such as: "When are we contrite through the love of God?" or: "When are we contrite through fear of punishment?" These are nothing but empty words

and mere prating on the part of those, who have not experienced how an alarmed conscience feels.

We affirm that contrition or true penitence is, to be alarmed in the conscience, to feel our sins and the great wrath of God on account of them, and to regret that we have sinned. This contrition takes place, when our sins are rebuked by the Word of God. For the substance of the Gospel is:—First, that it calls upon us to reform, and convicts all men of sin; and in the second place, that it offers through Christ the remission of sins, eternal life, felicity, complete salvation, and the Holy Spirit, through whom we are born anew.

Thus Christ also sums up the substance of the Gospel, when he says, Luke 24, 47: "That repentance and the remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." Of the terror and anxiety of the conscience the Scriptures speak in the 38th Psalm verse 4: "Mine iniquities are gone over mine head; as a heavy burden they are too heavy for me;" and in the sixth Psalm verses 2 and 3: "Have mercy upon me, O Lord; for I am weak: O Lord, heal me; for my bones are vexed. My soul is also sore vexed: but thou, O Lord, how long?" And Isa. 38, 10, 13, 14: "I said, in the cutting off my days, I shall go to the gates of the grave: I am deprived of the residue of my years," &c. "I reckoned till morning, that, as a lion, so will he break all my bones," &c. Again, "Mine eyes fail with looking upward: O Lord, I am oppressed; undertake for me." In this agony the conscience feels the wrath and anger of God against sin, which are unknown to idle and carnal-minded men, like the sophists; then only does it perceive that sin is the grossest disobedience to God; and then does the terrible wrath of God truly oppress the conscience; yea, human nature could not endure it, without support from the Word of God.

Thus Paul says, Gal. 2, 19: "I through the law am dead to the law;" for the law only accuses and alarms the conscience, and commands what we must do. Here our adversaries do not say a word about faith, about the Gospel or Christ, but teach the law only, and assert that we may secure divine favor by our grief, contrition, sorrow, and alarm, provided we love God, or are contrite, from love towards him. Great God, what preaching is this for consciences needing consolation! How is it possible for us to love God, when involved in such great terror and unspeakable agony, or feeling the great and terrible displeasure and wrath of God, which are then more forcibly felt, than any one on earth is able to express or describe? What else but despair do the teachings of such preachers and doctors lead

to, who preach no Gospel, no consolation, but simply the law, to the poor conscience in such deep distress? But we add the other part of repentance, namely, faith in Christ, and say, that in such terror, the Gospel of Christ, in which is promised the gracious remission of sin through him, should be presented to the conscience, should then believe its sins forgiven for the sake of Christ. This faith encourages, consoles, imparts life and joy to such contrite hearts; as Paul, Rom. 5, 1, says: "Being justified by faith, we have peace with God." This faith truly shows the difference between the contrition of Judas and Peter, of Saul and David. And for this reason the contrition of Judas and Saul was of no account, because they did not by faith cleave to the promise of God through Christ.

On the other hand, the contrition of David and Peter was genuine: for they by faith embraced the promise of God, that offers the remission of sins through Christ. For, properly speaking, there is no love of God in our hearts, until we are reconciled to God through Christ. No one can fulfil the law of God, or the first commandment, without Christ; as Paul Eph. 2, 18, says: "Through him we both have access by one Spirit unto the Father;" and faith during the whole life contends against sin, and is proved and strengthened by various trials. Where this faith exists, there only does the love of God follow, as we have stated above.

This is the proper definition of filial fear (*timor filialis*), namely, the fear and terror before God, in which, faith in Christ consoles and sustains the heart; servile fear, however, (*servilis timor*), is fear without faith, where there is nothing but wrath and despair.

Now the power of the keys announces to us the Gospel, through absolution; for absolution proclaims peace to the soul, and is the Gospel itself. Therefore, when we speak of faith, we include absolution; because faith comes by hearing (Rom. 10, 17). When we hear absolution, that is, the promise of divine grace, or the Gospel, our hearts and consciences are consoled. Inasmuch as God truly grants new life and comfort to our hearts through the word, our sins are truly remitted here on earth through the power of the keys, so that we are released from them before God in heaven; as we find, Luke 10, 16: "He that heareth you, heareth me." We should therefore esteem or believe the words of absolution no less, than the clear voice of God from heaven. Of right, absolution, this blessed, consolatory word, should be called the sacrament of repentance; as some of the more learned scholastics also say.

This faith in these words should be strengthened more and more, by hearing the preaching of the Word, by reading, and the use of the

sacraments; for these are the seals and signs of the covenant and of grace in the New Testament; these are signs of reconciliation and the remission of sins; for they offer forgiveness of sin, as the words in the Lord's Supper clearly show, Matt. 26, 26-28: "This is my body," &c. "This is my blood of the new testament," &c. Thus faith is strengthened by the words of absolution, by the preaching of the Gospel, and by the reception of the sacraments, that it may not perish in the alarm and anxiety of conscience.

This is a clear, perspicuous, and correct exhibition of repentance, from which we may learn the nature of the keys, the benefits of the sacraments, the blessings of Christ, and why and how he is our Mediator.

But since our adversaries condemn us, for proposing these two parts of repentance or conversion, we shall show that this is not our own, but the Scripture doctrine. Christ says, Matt. 11, 28: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." Here are two parts,—the labor or burden of which Christ speaks,—this is the misery, the great fear of the heart, in view of God's wrath; and secondly, the coming to Christ, which is simply to believe, that for his sake our sins are forgiven, and that through the Holy Ghost we are born anew and receive life. Contrition and faith, then, must be the chief parts of repentance.

Mark 1, 15, Christ says: "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel." In the first place, he convicts us of sin and alarms us; then he consoles us and announces the remission of sins. For faith in the Gospel is, not only to believe the history of the Gospel, a faith which the devils also have; but, properly, to believe that our sins are remitted through Christ. This is the faith, revealed unto us in the Gospel. Here are the two parts: contrition or the terror of the conscience, when he says, repent; and faith, when he adds: believe the Gospel. If any one should say, that Christ includes also the fruits of repentance, the whole new life, we shall not object. It is sufficient for us here, that the Scriptures state these two parts chiefly,—contrition and faith.

Paul in all his epistles, whenever he shows how we are converted, combines these two parts:—the mortification of the old man, that is, contrition, and fear of God's wrath and judgment; on the other hand, renovation through faith; for by faith we are consoled, renovated, and delivered from death and hell. Concerning these two parts he clearly says, Rom. 6, 11, that we are dead unto sin, which is brought about by contrition and fear; and again, that we shall live through Christ, which takes place, when we obtain con-

solation and life through faith. Now as faith is to give consolation, and peace to the conscience, agreeably to the passage, Rom. 5, 1: "Being justified by faith, we have peace," &c.; it follows that fear and anxiety previously exists in the conscience. Thus contrition and faith go together.

But what need is there for quoting many passages and testimonies from the Scriptures, when they abound with them; as in the 118th Psalm, verse 18: "The Lord hath chastened me sore: but he hath not given me over to death." And in the 119th Psalm, verse 28: "My soul melteth for heaviness: strengthen thou me according unto thy word." First, the Psalmist speaks of terror, or contrition; in the other part of the verse, he clearly shows how the contrite heart is consoled again, namely, by the Word of God, which offers grace, and reanimates us. Again, 1 Sam. 2, 6: "The Lord killeth, and maketh alive: he bringeth down to the grave, and bringeth up." Here also these two parts, contrition and faith, are referred to. Again, Isa: 28, 21: The Lord "shall be wroth as in the valley of Gibeon, that he may do his work, his strange work." He says that God will terrify, although this is not properly the work of God; for God's proper work is to make alive,—other works, such as to terrify and kill, are not properly God's. God brings only to life, and when he terrifies, he does so, that his blessed consolation may be the sweeter and more acceptable to us; for secure and carnal hearts, insensible of the wrath of God and their sins, do not appreciate consolation.

Thus the holy Scriptures usually connect these two parts, first the terror, afterwards the consolation; showing, that true repentance or conversion includes: first, sincere contrition, and then faith, which consoles the conscience. Surely it is hardly possible to present this subject more clearly or correctly. We know assuredly, that God thus operates in the Christians in his church.

These are therefore the two principal works of God in his people. Of these two things all the Scriptures speak: first, that he terrifies our hearts, and shows us our sins; secondly, that he consoles, encourages and revives us. These two things are taught in all the Scriptures; on the one hand the law, which shows us our misery, and condemns sin; on the other the Gospel; for God's promise of grace through Christ is repeated from Adam down through the whole Scripture; for in the first place, the promise of grace, or the first Gospel message was delivered to Adam: "I will put enmity," &c., Gen. 3, 15. Afterwards there were promises made to Abraham and other patriarchs, concerning the same Christ, which the Pro-

phets afterwards preached; then the same promises of grace were preached by Christ himself among the Jews, after he had come; and lastly they were spread abroad by the Apostles among the heathens in all the world. For, by faith in the Gospel, or in the promises concerning Christ, all the patriarchs and all the saints, from the beginning of the world, were justified before God, and not on account of their contrition or sorrow, or any kind of works.

These examples of the justification of saints, likewise set forth the above two parts, namely, the law and the Gospel; for Adam, after he had fallen, was first reprov'd, that his conscience might be alarmed and filled with anxiety; this is true sorrow or real contrition. Afterwards, God promised him grace and salvation through the blessed seed, namely, Christ, by whom death, sin, and the kingdom of the devil should be destroyed. Here God offered grace and the remission of sin unto man.

These are the two parts. Although God afterwards inflicted punishment on Adam, yet he did not thereby merit the remission of his sins. Concerning this punishment we shall hereafter speak.

In this manner, David was likewise severely reprov'd and alarmed by the prophet Nathan, so that he confessed, "I have sinned against the Lord," 2 Samuel 12, 13. Now this is contrition. Afterwards he heard the Gospel and absolution: "The Lord also hath put away thy sin; thou shalt not die." When David believed these words, his heart received consolation, light, and life; and although punishment was also inflicted upon him, yet he did not thereby merit the remission of sin. There are instances also, in which such particular punishment is not added: but these especially always belong to true repentance: first, that the conscience be sensible of and alarmed by sin; secondly, that we believe the divine promises; as set forth in the case of the poor sinful woman, (Luke 7, 38,) that came unto Christ and wept bitterly. Her weeping shows her sorrow or contrition; afterwards she heard the Gospel: "Thy sins are forgiven: thy faith hath saved thee: go in peace," (48, 50). This is the other principal part of repentance, namely, faith, which consoled her. From all this it is apparent to every Christian reader, that we are introducing no uncalled-for controversy, but clearly, correctly, and properly laying down the parts of repentance, without which sin cannot be forgiven, nor any one become righteous or holy before God, or be born anew.

The fruits of repentance and good works, and patience, willingly to bear the crosses and punishment God inflicts upon the old man, all follow, after our sins are thus remitted through faith and we are

born anew. We have clearly laid down these two parts, in order that the doctrine of faith in Christ, on which the sophists and Canonists are all silent, might also be taught at last; and in order that the nature of faith might be more clearly understood, when thus opposed to our great anxiety and terror.

But inasmuch as our adversaries expressly condemn, without fear or shame, this clear, indubitable and most excellent article, setting forth that men obtain the remission of their sins through faith in Christ, we shall offer some reasons and proofs for it, to show that we do not obtain remission of sin, *ex opere operato*, or through the work performed, through contrition or sorrow, &c., but exclusively through the faith, in which each one believes individually, that his own sins are forgiven. This article is the most important of those concerning which we are contending with our adversaries, and it is most essential for every Christian to know. But as we have said enough on the subject, in the above article concerning justification, we shall the more briefly speak of it here.

Our adversaries, when they speak of faith, say: "Faith must precede repentance." They do not mean the faith which justifies before God, but that which *in genere*, that is, in a general way, believes that there is a God, a hell, &c. But we, in addition, require each one firmly to believe in remission to himself, that his sins are forgiven for Christ's sake. We contend for the faith which must follow terror, console the conscience, and restore the heart to peace in this severe strugg'le and great anxiety.

We shall, God willing, always defend it, and maintain against all the powers of hell, that this faith is necessary to obtain the forgiveness of sins. We therefore add this part to repentance. Nor can the Christian church hold otherwise, but that sin is forgiven through such faith; although our adversaries furiously clamor against it.

In the first place, we ask our adversaries, whether it is also a part of repentance, to hear or receive absolution? For if they separate absolution from confession, as they are adepts in making subtile distinctions, no one will be able to ascertain or tell the use of confession without absolution. But if they do not separate absolution from confession, they must admit that faith in the word of Christ is a part of repentance, as we cannot receive absolution except through faith. But that absolution cannot be received, except through faith, can be proved with Paul, (Rom. 4, 16,) who says that no one can receive the promises of God, except through faith.

Absolution, however, is nothing but the Gospel, a divine promise of the grace and favor of God, &c. Therefore, no one can possess

or obtain it, except through faith. For how can the declarations of absolution benefit those who do not believe them? But to doubt absolution, is to make God a liar. While the heart wavers and doubts, it regards the promises of God as uncertain. It is therefore written, 1 John 5, 10: "He that believeth not God, hath made him a liar; because he believeth not the record that God gave of his Son."

In the second place, our adversaries are surely obliged to confess that the remission of sins is a part of repentance, or, to speak after their own manner, that it is *finis*, the end, or *terminus ad quem*, the object, aim, of the whole of repentance. For what would repentance avail us, if the remission of sins were not obtained? That, therefore, through which the remission of sins is obtained, must of course be one of the principal parts of repentance. But it is certainly true and obvious, though all devils, all the powers of hell, cry out against it, that no one can embrace the annunciation of the remission of sins, but by faith, Rom. 3, 25: "Whom God hath set forth to be a propitiation, through faith in his blood," &c.; again, Rom. 5, 2: "By whom also we have access by faith into this grace wherein we stand," &c. An alarmed conscience, which feels its sins, soon perceives that the wrath of God cannot be appeased by our miserable works; but the conscience truly obtains peace, when it cleaves to Christ the Mediator, and believes the divine promises. For those do not understand the remission of sins, or how it is obtained, who imagine that the heart and conscience can be pacified without faith in Christ.

The apostle, 1 Pet. 2, 6, quotes the words of Isaiah: "He that believeth on him, shall not be confounded." The hypocrites shall therefore be confounded before God, who imagine that they will obtain the remission of sins by their works, and not for Christ's sake. And, Acts 10, 43, Peter says: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him, shall receive remission of sins." He could not have expressed himself more clearly than he has in the words, "Through his name," and, "All who believe in him."

We therefore obtain the remission of sins through the name of Christ, that is, for Christ's sake, and not on account of our merit or our works, and this takes place when we believe that our sins are forgiven for Christ's sake.

True, our adversaries exclaim that they are the Christian church, and that they hold what the *catholic* or universal church holds. But the apostle Peter, in reference to this case, and to our chief article, also speaks of a *catholic* or universal church, saying: To this

Jesus give all the Prophets witness, that we obtain remission of sins through his name. Most assuredly the unanimous voice of all the holy Prophets—for God regards a single prophet even as a precious treasure—is at least equal to a decree, a declaration, or a unanimous, strong conclusion of the universal, catholic, Christian, holy church, and ought to be so regarded.

We shall not concede to popes, bishops, or the church, the power to maintain or determine any thing against the unanimous voice of all the Prophets. Yet pope Leo X. undertook to condemn this article as an error, and our adversaries do the same.

Thus it plainly appears what a noble Christian church this must be, that undertakes, not only to condemn by public, written decrees and edicts, the article, that we obtain remission of sins without works, through faith in Christ; but also to condemn and murder the innocent for confessing this article. They exile pious, upright men for teaching thus; and hunt them down with all manner of tyranny and cruelty.

But they may say, that they have the authority of distinguished teachers, such as Scotus, Gabriel, and others, in their favor, besides the sayings of the Fathers, which are quoted in the Decrees in a mutilated form. True, they are all called teachers and writers, but by their notes these birds may be known. These writers have taught nothing but philosophy, and were ignorant of Christ and the work of God: this is manifest from their books.

We shall therefore not permit ourselves to be misled by them; for we are sure that we may unhesitatingly oppose the words of the holy apostle Peter, as those of a great doctor, to the whole mass of Sententiaries, though there were thousands of them. Peter clearly says, that this doctrine is the unanimous voice of all the Prophets; and God powerfully confirmed this glorious declaration of the illustrious Apostle, at the time, by the pouring out of the Holy Spirit; for thus says the text: "While Peter yet spake these words, the Holy Ghost fell on all them which heard the word," Acts 10, 44.

Therefore Christians should carefully observe that it is the word and command of God which declares that our sins are forgiven without merit, through Christ, not for the sake of our works. This is a genuine, efficacious, sure, and imperishable consolation against all the terrors of sin and death, against all the trials and despair, the anguish and terror of the conscience.

Of this the idle sophists know but little; and the blessed Gospel of the remission of sins through the blessed seed, Christ, has been the greatest treasure and consolation, from the beginning of the

world, to all the patriarchs, pious kings, prophets, and believers; for they believed in the same Christ in whom we believe. From the beginning of the world no saint was saved, except by faith in this Gospel. Peter therefore says, that it is the unanimous voice of all the Prophets. The Apostles uniformly preach the same thing, and tell us that the Prophets spoke as through one mouth.

We have, moreover, the testimony of the holy Fathers. Bernard says in clear terms: "Therefore, it is necessary above all things to know that we cannot obtain the forgiveness of sins otherwise than through the grace of God; but you must also believe that you, as well as others, receive forgiveness through Christ. This is the testimony of the Holy Spirit in you, when he says in your heart: 'Your sins are forgiven you,' Matt. 9, 2. For thus the Apostle says, (Rom. 3, 24,) that men are justified through faith without merit."

These words of St. Bernard highly extol and properly illustrate our doctrine; for he says, that we must not only believe in a general way that our sins are remitted, but also adds: "Each one must believe, individually, that his own sins are forgiven." Moreover, he teaches still more specifically how our hearts may be assured of grace and the remission of sin, namely, by the comfort and peace wrought within us. But what now, we ask our adversaries? Is St. Bernard also a heretic? What more do ye require? Will ye yet deny that we obtain the remission of sins through faith?

In the third place, our adversaries affirm that sin is forgiven, *quia attritus vel contritus elicit actum dilectionis Dei*, when we undertake by our own reason to love God; through this work (say they) we obtain the remission of sins. This is surely abolishing the Gospel and the divine promises, and teaching merely the law: for they speak of nothing but the law and our works, as the law requires love.

They, moreover, teach us to trust that we obtain the forgiveness of our sins through such contrition and through our love. What is this but relying on our works, and not upon the promises concerning Christ? Now if the law is sufficient to obtain the remission of sins, what need is there of Christ, or of the Gospel? But we call men away from the law and from their works, to the Gospel and the promises of grace; for this offers us Christ and pure grace, and bids us rely on the promise, that for the sake of Christ we are reconciled to the Father, and not on account of our contrition or love. There is no Mediator or Reconciler but Christ: and consequently we cannot fulfil the law, until we are reconciled through Christ. And

though we do some good, yet we must believe that we obtain remission of sin not on account of these works, but for Christ's sake.

To assert, therefore, that we obtain remission of sin through the law, or in any way except through faith in Christ, is a reproach to Christ and an abolition of the Gospel. This we have showed above, in the article *de Justificatione*, where we gave our reasons for teaching that we are justified by faith, and not by the love of God, or by our love towards him.

Therefore, when our adversaries teach that we obtain the remission of sins through contrition and love, and encourage us to rely on them, they inculcate nothing but the law, which, however, they do not understand; especially with regard to the kind of love it requires towards God. Like the Jews, they look only upon the veiled face of Moses. Even if we suppose that works and love are there; yet neither works nor love can reconcile us to God, or weigh as much as Christ; as the 143d Psalm, verse 2, says: "Enter not into judgment with thy servant," &c. We should not, therefore, attribute the honor of Christ to our works.

Paul, for the same reason, contends that we are not justified by the law, and opposes to the law the promise of God, the promise of the grace offered unto us for Christ's sake. He calls us away from the law to this divine promise; he desires us to look upon God and his promise, and to regard Christ the Lord as our treasure; for this promise would be useless, if we were justified before God by the law, and if we merit the remission of our sins through our righteousness.

Now, there can be no doubt that God made the promise, and that Christ came, because we were unable to fulfil the law. We must therefore be reconciled through the promise, before we fulfil the law; the promise, however, cannot be embraced, except through faith.

Hence all those who are really contrite, take hold of the promise of grace through faith, and firmly believe that they are reconciled with the Father through Christ. This is likewise the meaning of Paul, Rom. 4, 16: "Therefore it is of faith, that it might be by grace; to the end the promise might be sure;" and Gal. 3, 22: "The scripture hath concluded all under sin, that the promise by faith of Jesus Christ might be given to them that believe,"—that is, all men are under sin, and they cannot be redeemed, unless they embrace the promise of the remission of sins through faith. We must, therefore, obtain the forgiveness of sins through faith, before we fulfil the law.

Yet, as we have stated above, love surely follows faith; for those

who believe, receive the Holy Spirit, and therefore begin to be devoted and obedient to the law.

We would quote more passages bearing upon this subject, but the Bible is full of them. Besides, we do not wish to be too lengthy, in order that this matter may be the more clearly understood; for there can be no doubt at all about the meaning of Paul, that we obtain the remission of sins for Christ's sake, through faith, and that we must meet the wrath of God, not with our works, but with the Mediator.

Nor should it disturb pious Christians, that our adversaries misinterpret the clear declarations of Paul; for even the most simple, definite, distinct, and clear language is not secure against perversion.

But we positively know that the views which we have advanced, are the true meaning of Paul. Nor can there be any doubt that this doctrine alone is calculated really and truly to pacify and console us in the actual struggle and agony of death and of temptation, as experience has shown.

Away, therefore, with the pharisaic doctrines of our adversaries: that we do not obtain the remission of sins through faith, but must merit it by our works and love towards God; and again, that by these we must appease the wrath of God. For this is really a pharisaic doctrine, a doctrine of the law and not of the Gospel, to teach that we are justified by the law, before we are reconciled to God through Christ; whereas Christ, John 15, 5, says: "Without me ye can do nothing;" and again, "I am the vine, ye are the branches."

According to our adversaries, however, we are not branches of Christ, but of Moses; for they would be justified before God by the law, and offer their works and love to him, before they are branches of the vine of Christ. But Paul, who surely is a much greater divine than they, expressly asserts and maintains that no one can keep the law without Christ. For this reason, those who feel or have experienced their sins and anguish of conscience, must lay hold of the gracious promise, that they are reconciled to God through faith, for the sake of Christ, before they fulfil the law. All this is plain and clear enough to every pious mind. And from this, Christians will readily perceive why we have asserted above that we are justified before God through faith alone, not through our works or love. All our ability, our doings, and works, are too weak to pacify and avert the wrath of God: we must therefore offer Christ the Mediator.

But finally, we ask our adversaries: when is the poor conscience

to obtain peace and tranquillity, if we obtain grace and the remission of sins, because we love God, or because we fulfil the law? The law always accuses us; for no man fulfils the law. Paul, Rom. 4, 15, says: "The law worketh wrath."

Chrysostom and the Sententiaries propose the question: *How do we become assured that our sins are forgiven?* It is truly worthy of inquiry. Happy he that answers aright! It is impossible to reply to this most vital question; impossible, truly to console or pacify the afflicted conscience, unless we answer thus:

It was God's determination and command from the beginning of the world, that our sins should be remitted through faith in the blessed seed; that is, through faith for Christ's sake, without merit. If any one doubts this, or wavers, he makes God's promise a lie, see 1 John 5, 10. Therefore we say that the Christian should firmly believe this to be the command of God; and if he thus holds it, he is assured, pacified, and consoled.

Our adversaries, with all their preaching and teaching otherwise, leave the poor conscience in doubt. It is impossible for us to be at rest, or to enjoy tranquillity and peace, while we doubt God's mercy; because when we doubt whether God is gracious to us, whether we are doing right, whether our sins are forgiven, how can we then call upon God, or rest assured that he regards and hears our prayers? Thus the whole life would be faithless, and we could not serve God aright. This is what Paul says, Rom. 14, 23: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." And as they ever continue doubting thus, they never realize what God, Christ, or faith, is; hence they die at last in despair, without God and without any knowledge of him.

Such is the baleful doctrine of our adversaries,—a doctrine which sets aside the Gospel, suppresses Christ, produces sorrow in the heart, torments the conscience, and finally, when temptations arise, plunges the soul into despair.

Your Imperial Majesty will therefore graciously consider that this does not concern gold or silver, but the soul and conscience. Let all honorable and intelligent men carefully note the true nature of this matter. We are willing to let all good men judge, whether we or our adversaries have taught what is most beneficial to the Christian conscience. For most assuredly we take no pleasure in dissensions and strife. Had not the strongest and most weighty reasons, affecting the conscience, our salvation, and our souls, induced us to contend so ardently with our adversaries, we should remain silent; but inasmuch as they condemn the holy Gospel, the clear testimony of the Apostles, and divine truth, we cannot, consistently with the

will of God and the dictates of conscience, deny this blessed doctrine and divine truth, from which we expect our only, eternal, and greatest consolation, when this frail, transitory life shall cease and be past the reach of human aid; nor can we in any way forsake this cause, which is not ours only, but that of the whole Christian church, and pertains to Jesus Christ, our richest treasure.

We have now shown for what reason we proposed these two parts of repentance, namely, contrition and faith; and we have pursued this course, because throughout the works of our adversaries we find many mutilated passages, concerning repentance, quoted from the writings of Augustine and other ancient Fathers, which they have in all cases explained and distorted, so as entirely to suppress the doctrine of faith. For instance:—Repentance is a certain pain, by which our sins are punished; again, repentance is, to deplore the sins committed, and to do them no more. In these passages faith is not mentioned at all, nor do they in their schools, where they discuss such passages at length, in any way refer to it.

In order, then, that the doctrine of faith might be better understood, we have set down faith as a part of repentance. For those passages in relation to our contrition and good works, which do not touch upon the subject of faith, are very dangerous, as experience has shown. Now, if they had properly considered the great danger of souls, the Sententiaries and Canonists would of course have been more cautious in writing about their Decrees; for as the Fathers speak of the other part of repentance also, and mention not only one, but both, namely, contrition and faith, our adversaries should have presented both together.

Tertullian also speaks of faith in a very consolatory manner, and especially commends the divine oath of which the Prophet speaks, Ezek. 33, 11: “As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live.” “Inasmuch as God swears,” says he, “that he delights not in the death of the sinner, he certainly requires faith in the oath he has sworn himself, that he will forgive us our sins. Even without this we should regard the promises of God in the most exalted light. Now this promise is confirmed by an oath;” therefore if any one holds that his sins are not forgiven, he makes God a liar, which is the greatest blasphemy. For Tertullian further says: *Invitat ad salutem, jurans etiam, etc.*: that is: “God invites us, to our own salvation, by his oath, to believe him. Blessed are they, for whose sake God swears! Woe unto us, if we believe not the divine oath!”

Now we must remember that this faith must firmly believe that

God forgives our sins through grace for Christ's sake, not on account of our works, our confession, or expiation. As soon as we rely on our works, we are in doubt; for when the conscience is alarmed, we soon perceive that our best works have no value in the sight of God. Hence the remarks of Ambrose on repentance are excellent: "We must repent, and also believe that grace is imparted to us, provided, however, that we look for grace through faith; for faith awaits and obtains grace as from a handwriting. Again, faith is even that which covers our sins." Thus we find clear passages in the works of the Fathers, not only in regard to works, but to faith also. But our adversaries, not understanding the true nature of repentance, do not comprehend the declarations of the Fathers. While they extract from them a few mutilated passages concerning a part of repentance, namely, contrition and works, they pass by what is said of faith.

VI. OF CONFESSION AND EXPIATION (SATISFACTION).

Pious and worthy Christians can easily perceive the importance of having and maintaining in the churches the true and indubitable doctrine of repentance, or contrition and faith. For the great imposition of indulgences, &c., and the inappropriate doctrines of the sophists, have sufficiently taught us the great evils and dangers arising from mistakes on this subject. How many a pious soul most laboriously sought under Popery the right way in this matter, without finding it in such darkness!

We have, therefore, always taken great pains, to teach clearly, definitely, and correctly on this subject. With respect to confession and expiation we have not contended much; because we also retain confession, on account of absolution, which is the word of God, absolving us from our sins by the power of the keys. It would, therefore, be contrary to the will of God to abolish absolution in the churches.

Those who condemn absolution, have no conception of the remission of sins or of the power of the keys. But in our Confession we have already stated our view, that God does not command the enumeration of sins. For their declaration,—as every judge must hear the cases and offences, before he pronounces judgment, so must our sins be enumerated, &c.,—is not applicable to the case. Absolution is simply the command to acquit, and not a new court of inquiry into sin; for God is the judge. He committed to the Apostles no judicial authority, but the execution of grace, to absolve those who de-

sire it. And, indeed, they release and absolve from sins which are not remembered. Absolution is therefore a voice of the Gospel, through which we receive consolation, and it is no judgment or law.

But it appears ridiculous and absurd to intelligent men, to apply the declaration of Solomon, Prov. 27, 23: *Diligenter cognosce vultum pecoris tui*, that is, "Be thou diligent to know the state of thy flocks," &c., to confession or absolution; for Solomon is not speaking here of confession, but is commanding the heads of families to be satisfied with their own, and to abstain from what belongs to others; he is here simply commanding each one to be diligent in taking care of his flocks and possessions, and not to forget the fear, the law, and Word of God, through avarice.

But our adversaries distort the Scriptures to suit their fancy, contrary to the natural import of the plain terms in the passage: *Cognosce vultum pecoris*, &c. Here *cognoscere* is made to signify hearing confession; cattle or sheep must signify men; and *stabulum* (stable) we think, must mean a school containing *such* doctors and orators. It is, however, perfectly natural for those who thus despise the holy Scriptures and the arts, to make such gross grammatical blunders. Even if any one felt a desire to compare the head of a family, in this passage of Solomon, with a pastor, *vultus* would here mean, not *arcana conscientiae*, (secrets of the conscience or heart,) but the external walk.

We shall, however, let this pass. *Confession* is mentioned in several places in the Psalms; as in 32, 5: "I acknowledge my sin unto thee, and mine iniquity have I not hid." This confession and acknowledgment, made to God, are contrition itself; for when we confess to God, we must acknowledge in our hearts, that we are sinners, and not merely repeat the words with the lips, as the hypocrites do. Therefore the confession, made to God, is the contrition, which makes the heart sensible of the serious displeasure and wrath of God, approves his anger and the impossibility of his being reconciled by our merits; and yet, prompts us to seek mercy, since God has promised grace in Christ. Such is the confession in the 51st Psalm, 4th verse: "Against thee, thee only, have I sinned, and done this evil in thy sight; that thou mightest be justified when thou speakest, and be clear when thou judgest;" that is, I confess that I am a sinner, and that I deserve eternal wrath, and cannot appease thy wrath with my works or merit; I therefore say that thou art just and justly punishest us. I acknowledge thy justice, though the hypocrites condemn thee for not regarding their merits and good work. Yes,

I know that my works cannot stand before thy judgment; but we shall be justified, when thou, in thy mercy, regardest us as just.

Perhaps some one will refer to James 5, 16: "Confess your faults one to another." But James is not speaking of confession to the priest, but of reconciliation and acknowledgments between brethren.

But our adversaries condemn many of their own teachers, when they maintain that an enumeration of sins is necessary and commanded of God. For, although we retain confession, and believe it to be expedient to question the young and ignorant, in order that they may be the better instructed; yet it must be kept within such bounds as not to ensnare the conscience, which can never be at peace while it is under the false impression that the specification of sins is a duty to God.

Accordingly, the assertion of our adversaries, that our salvation requires a complete confession of every sin, is entirely false, because such a confession is impossible. O, how miserably have they perplexed and tormented many a pious soul, by teaching that confession must be complete, and that no sin dare remain unconfessed! for how can we always be sure of having confessed all?

The Fathers likewise advert to confession; they do not, however, speak of the enumeration of secret sins, but of a ceremony of public penance; because formerly those who lived in open vice, were not reinstated into the church, without a public ceremony and reproof. They were therefore required to make a special confession of their sins to the priest so that expiations might be imposed, according to the magnitude of the transgression. But this whole matter was unlike the enumeration of sins, of which we are speaking; for this confession was not made because sin cannot be remitted before God without it; but because, without a knowledge of the sin, external chastisement could not be imposed.

From this external ceremony of public penance the word *satisfactio* or expiation originated. The Fathers would not receive those again, who were found living in open vice, without reproof. There were many reasons for this; for it served to show, that open vice would be punished, even as the comment in the Decrees says. Besides, it was improper to permit those who had fallen into public sins, immediately to approach the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, without examination. All these ceremonies have long since discontinued, and it is unnecessary to re-establish them; because they contribute nothing to reconciliation before God. Nor was it at all the opinion of the Fathers, that men could thus obtain the remission of their sins; although such outward ceremonies easily lead the inex-

perienced to believe that they contribute to salvation. Now, such a view is altogether Jewish and heathenish ; for the heathens also had certain purifications, which they imagined would reconcile them to God.

But now while this mode of public penance has passed away, the name *satisfactio* or expiation has remained ; and the shadow of that old custom still continues, in the imposition of penances, in confession, which they call *opera non debita* ; we call them *satisfactiones canonicæ*. With respect to these and to the enumeration of sins, we teach, that God has not commanded these external ceremonies, that they are unnecessary, and do not contribute to the remission of sins ; for this doctrine must, above all things, be maintained and preserved, that we obtain the remission of sins through faith, and not through our works, performed either before or after we are converted or born anew in Christ.

And we have especially spoken of these *satisfactions*, that no one might so misapprehend them, as to believe that we could merit the forgiveness of sins by our work ; and that the doctrine of faith might not be suppressed. For the dangerous error concerning *satisfaction* or expiation, was established and supported by certain incorrect views advanced by our adversaries, namely, that expiation reconciles the divine wrath and displeasure.

Our adversaries themselves, however, confess that *satisfactiones*, or expiations, do not remove guilt before God, and set up the fiction, that they only take away the pain or punishment. For they teach that, when sin is forgiven, God forgives only the guilt or *culpa*, without means ; and yet, because he is a just God, he does not leave sins unpunished, and changes eternal into temporal punishment. They further add, that a part of the temporal punishment is remitted through the power of the keys ; but a portion must be redeemed by *satisfactiones* or expiations. It is impossible to understand which part of the punishment or penalty is released through the power of the keys, unless they mean that a portion of the pain of purgatory is remitted ; from which it would follow, that expiations liberate only from the pains of purgatory. They assert, moreover, that expiations are efficacious before God, although made by those who have fallen into mortal sin ; as if God could be reconciled by those who are in mortal sin, and are his enemies.

These are nothing but visionary, fictitious doctrines and assertions, having no foundation whatever in the Scriptures, and being repugnant to all the writings of the ancient Fathers. Nor did even Lombardus speak thus of expiations. The scholastics, it is true,

understood from hearsay, that at some time or other expiations (*satisfactiones*) were customary in the church, but they did not bear in mind that it was an external ceremony, in which (*publice pœnitentes*) the penitents had to appear before the church, in a rite, instituted:—first, as a deterrent and an example, from which others might take warning; secondly, as a test, whether these sinners or penitents, who desired forgiveness, had sincerely repented. In a word, they did not perceive that such expiation was an external discipline and chastisement, like other worldly discipline, instituted as a restraint and deterrent. They taught, moreover, that it is not only a discipline, but also effects reconciliation with God, and is essential to salvation. But as they have, in many other instances, confounded the spiritual kingdom of Christ with the kingdom of the world and external discipline; so they have likewise done in regard to expiations. The notes to the canons, however, repeatedly show, that these expiations were intended to serve only as an example before the church.

But here let us observe, how our adversaries demonstrate and establish their wild conceits in the Confutation, which they at last obtruded on your Imperial Majesty. They quote many passages from the Scriptures, to make it appear to the uninformed, that their doctrine relative to expiations, is founded on the Scriptures, which, however, was not yet known in the days of Lombardus. They refer to: “Repent ye,” Mark 1, 15; “Bring forth fruits meet for repentance,” Matt. 3, 8; again, “Yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness,” Rom. 6, 19; that Christ said “Repent;” that he commanded the Apostles to *preach repentance*, Luke 24, 47; and that Peter preached *repentance*, Acts 2, 38. Afterwards they quote certain passages from the Fathers and Canons, and arrive at the conclusion, that expiations shall not be abolished in the church, contrary to the Gospel, to the Decrees of the Fathers and the councils, and to the decision of the holy church; but those who obtain absolution, shall perform the penance and expiation imposed on them by the priest.

May God confound these impious sophists, who so basely distort the holy Gospel to their idle dreams. What pious and honest heart will not be deeply grieved by such a monstrous abuse of the divine Word? Christ says “Repent;” the Apostles also preach *repentance*. Do these passages prove that God does not forgive sin, except on account of this imaginary expiation? Who taught these rude, shameless dolts such reasoning? But to trifle with God’s Word, thus wantonly and disgustingly, is neither reasoning nor even sophistry,

but simply knavery. Hence they insidiously quote the Scripture passage, "Repent," &c., so that the ignorant may think, when they hear these words cited against us from the Gospel, that we do not at all approve of repentance. Such are the wicked artifices they practise towards us. Although they know that we teach the truth in regard to repentance; yet they attempt to excite suspicion and animosity against us, and to induce the ignorant to cry, "crucify, crucify these dangerous heretics who despise repentance, and are so manifestly proved to be liars."

But we comfort ourselves, knowing that among godly, honorable, pious, and upright men, such shameless falsehoods and perversion of the holy Scriptures will be harmless. And the Lord God, as surely as he lives, will not long suffer such bold blasphemy and unheard of wickedness; for the first and second commandments of God will certainly confound them.

As our Confession embraces nearly every prominent article of the whole Christian doctrine, nothing under the sun can be more momentous. This all-important cause concerns the entire, holy, Christian religion, the welfare and harmony of the whole Christian church, and of numberless souls throughout the world, now and hereafter. Our opponents should of right, therefore, have taken the greatest pains to select more pious, intelligent, experienced, able, and honest men to act for them in this business, men more sincerely devoted to the common good, the harmony of the church, and the welfare of the empire, than the wicked, frivolous sophists who wrote the Confutation.

And you, sir, Cardinal Campegius, the sagacious agent, to whom these affairs were entrusted at Rome, and whose wisdom is applauded, even if you care for nothing but the honor of the Pope and the See of Rome, should have managed these affairs better, and made every effort to prevent such sophists from writing a miserable confutation like this, on a subject so great and important. This fact must inevitably, both now and in future, subject you to derision, injure your reputation and name, and bring eternal, irrevocable disgrace upon you.

Ye Romanists, perceive that these are the latter days, in which Christ warns us that many dangers shall befall the church. Now, as you would be called the watchmen, the shepherds, and the rulers of the church, you should exercise the greatest caution and vigilance at such a time as this. There are already many evidences before us, indicating that, unless you properly shape your course according to the present state of things, a radical change will come upon the whole Roman See and all its affairs. Nor need you undertake, or expect, to

retain the congregations and churches for yourselves and the Roman See, by force alone ; for good men are calling for truth and proper instruction from the Word of God ; and to them death even is less painful, than uncertainty and doubt in doctrine. They must, therefore, seek instruction somewhere. If you would keep the churches in your connection, you must endeavor to provide for correct instruction and preaching, by which you can secure their good will and constant obedience.

We shall now return to our subject. The passages of Scripture, quoted by our adversaries, do not speak of the expiations or satisfactions, about which our adversaries are contending. It is nothing but a distortion of the Scriptures, therefore, to explain the Word of God according to their opinions. We say, where there is true repentance, a genuine renovation of the heart by the Holy Ghost, there good fruits and good works surely follow ; it is impossible, that conversion to God, repentance and sincere contrition should take place without being followed by good works or fruits ; for the heart or conscience, that has fully felt its wretchedness and sins, and is truly alarmed, will not relish or seek the lusts of the world ; and whosoever has faith, is thankful to God and sincerely regards and loves his commandments. Nor can the heart be truly penitent, when we manifest no external good works and Christian patience. And this is the meaning of John the Baptist, when he says : " Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance," Matt. 3, 8 ; and of Paul, who says : " Yield your members servants to righteousness unto holiness," Rom. 6, 19. And Christ, when he says : " Repent," Mark 1, 15, undoubtedly refers to the whole of repentance, and to the whole new life and its fruits. He does not mean the hypocritical expiations, of which the scholastics dream, boldly asserting, that they pass for punishment before God, even when performed by those who have fallen into mortal sin. A precious service of God, indeed !

There are likewise many other reasons, showing that the above passages of Scripture do not accord with these expiations of the scholastics. They set up the fiction, that expiations are works which we are not under obligation to do. But the Holy Scriptures, in these passages, require works that we are bound to do ; for the word of Christ : " Repent," is a divine commandment.

Again, our adversaries say that those who confess, although unwilling to accept the expiations imposed on them, do not sin on that account, but must suffer punishment and make expiation in purgatory. Now, there can be no doubt whatever, that the passages : " Repent," &c. ; " Yield your members servants to righteousness,"

and others of this kind, are the words of Christ and of the Apostles, and do not refer to purgatory, but to this life alone.

They can not, therefore, be applied to the imposed expiations, which may be accepted or not; for the commandments of God are not thus left to our discretion, &c.

In the third place, the Canon-law of the Pope declares, that indulgences remit such expiations, *Cap. Cum ex eo, de pœnitentiis*. But indulgences release no one from the commandments: "Repent," "Bring forth, therefore, fruits meet for repentance," &c.

It is, therefore, evident that these passages of Scripture are altogether misapplied, when referred to expiations; for if the punishments of purgatory are expiations, (*satisfactiones* or *satispassiones*,) or if expiations are an acquittal from the pains of purgatory, the above words of Christ and Paul must likewise prove that the souls descend into purgatory, and there suffer punishment. Now as this necessarily follows from the views of our adversaries, all these passages must appear in a new light, and be explained thus:—*Facite fructus, &c.* Bring forth fruits meet for repentance; that is, suffer in purgatory after this life. But it is an irksome task, thus to multiply words about the obvious errors of our adversaries; for it is well known, that these passages of Scripture refer to the works which we are bound to do, and to the whole new life of the Christian, &c.; not to the fictitious works to which our adversaries allude, but which we are not required to perform. And yet, with these falsehoods, they defend their monastic system, the traffic in the mass, and numberless other traditions, saying that these works expiate the punishment, though not the crime before God.

Now, as the passages cited from the Scriptures, do not at all say, that the works, which we are not required to perform, pay for eternal punishment or for purgatory, our adversaries have no ground whatever to assert, that such expiations remove the punishment of purgatory.

Neither has the power of the keys received authority to impose penalties, or to remit them in part, or altogether. Such dreams and falsehoods are nowhere found in the Scriptures. Christ refers to the remission of sins, when he says: "Whatsoever ye loose," &c., Matt. 18, 18. When our sins are forgiven, death is likewise removed, and eternal life is given. And the text: "Whatsoever ye loose," &c., does not speak of the imposition of punishment, but of the retention of the sins of those who do not repent.

Now, although we maintain that good fruits and works should follow genuine repentance, to honor God and to thank him, (these

good works and fruits, such as fasts, prayer, alms, &c., are enjoined by him,) yet the Scriptures nowhere teach, that the wrath of God, or eternal punishment, can be removed by the punishment of purgatory, or by *satisfactiones* or expiations, that is, by certain works which, moreover, we would not be bound to do, nor that the power of the keys has authority to impose punishment, or to remit a part of it. Now, our adversaries should prove these things from the Scripture, but they will not attempt this.

It is, moreover, certain that the death of Christ is an expiation, not only for guilt before God, but also for eternal death, as Hosea 13, 14, clearly says: "O death, I will be thy plagues." What an outrage then, to say that while the death of Christ expiates our guilt before God, the punishment which we suffer redeems us from eternal death! Thus the language of the Prophet, "O death, I will be thy plagues," is applied, not to Christ, but to our works, nay, to miserable human ordinances, which God never commanded. Moreover, they have the boldness to say, that these works expiate eternal death, even when performed by those who are in mortal sin.

This improper language of our adversaries must, of course, painfully affect the pious heart; for whosoever reads and considers it, must indeed be deeply grieved at this manifest doctrine of the devil, which Satan himself has disseminated in the world, to suppress the true doctrine of the Gospel, in order that no one, or but few, might be instructed in the law or the Gospel, repentance, faith, or the benefits of Christ.

Thus they say concerning the law: God, considering our infirmities, ordained a certain measure of works, that man is under obligation to fill, (the works of the Ten Commandments, &c. ;) so that by means of the superfluous works, *operibus supererogationis*, that is, by the works which he is not required to do, he might expiate his errors and sins.

Now, they imagine that man can so fulfil the law of God, as to do even more than it requires; whereas the holy Scriptures and the Prophets all show, that the law of God requires much more than we can ever do. But they fancy, that the divine law and God himself are satisfied with external works, and they neglect to see how that the law requires us to love God with all our heart, &c., and to be free from every lust. Accordingly, no one on earth does as much as the law requires.

Their fiction, therefore, that we are able to do even more than the divine law requires, must appear altogether absurd and puerile to intelligent men; for although we are able to perform the paltry

external works, which are commanded, not of God, but of men, and which Paul calls beggarly ordinances, yet it is idle and absurd to believe, that by their means we fulfil the law of God, nay, even do more than he requires.

Again, God has enjoined true prayer, alms, and fasts; and, having been ordained by him, they cannot be omitted without sin. But those works, as they are not commanded in the divine law, but framed according to the will of man, are nothing but the ordinances of men, of which Christ says: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines, the commandments of men," Matt. 15, 9; for instance, certain fasts, which were instituted not to mortify the flesh, but to honor God, and as Scotus says, to release from eternal death; and particular prayers and alms, designed to be a service to God, to reconcile us to him, *ex opere operato*, and to liberate us from everlasting condemnation. For they maintain, that such works, *ex opere operato*, that is, through their very performance, expiate sin, and that such expiation is valid even against mortal sin.

There are, moreover, other works, still less authorized by divine command; such as rosaries, and pilgrimages of various kinds; for some go in full armor to St. James, others with bare feet, &c. This Christ calls vain and useless worship; hence such works have no power to reconcile God, as our adversaries say. Such works, as pilgrimages, they exalt as great and precious, calling them *opera supererogationis*; and, what is even more base,—nay, blasphemous,—that honor is ascribed to them which belongs to the blood and death of Christ alone, as if they were the *pretium*, or treasure, by which we are redeemed from eternal death. It is the infamous work of the devil himself, thus to defame and revile the holy and precious death of Christ.

In this manner, these pilgrimages are preferred to the genuine works prescribed in the Ten Commandments, and thus the law of God is obscured in two ways; first, because they suppose that they have satisfied the law, by performing these external works; secondly, because they regard the insignificant ordinances of men more highly than the works which God has commanded.

Moreover, the doctrine of repentance and grace is likewise suppressed; for we cannot be acquitted from eternal death and the terrors of hell, in the way they imagine; a far different and greater treasure than our works is required to redeem us from death, eternal anguish, and pain. For the righteousness of works is inefficient, and the selfrighteous do not even taste what death is; but as the wrath of God cannot be overcome otherwise than by faith in Christ; so

also death is subdued by Christ alone, as Paul says: "But thanks be to God, which giveth us the victory through our Lord Jesus Christ," 1 Cor. 15, 57. He does not say, which giveth us the victory through our expiations.

Our adversaries treat very indifferently and vaguely the remission of sins before God, not perceiving that the forgiveness of such guilt, and redemption from God's wrath and from eternal death, are things of such great importance, that they cannot be obtained, except through the only Mediator, Christ, and by faith in him.

Now, as the death and blood of Christ are the proper expiation for eternal death, and, as our adversaries themselves acknowledge, we are under no obligation to do such works of expiation, which are human ordinances, and which Christ (Matt. 15, 9,) calls vain worship, we may safely conclude, even from their own assertions, that God has not enjoined such expiations, and that they do not redeem us from eternal punishment and guilt, or from the punishment of purgatory.

Our adversaries will perhaps reply, that punishment properly belongs to repentance; for Augustine says: "Repentance is vengeance, anguish, and punishment, on account of sin." Answer: Our opponents display the grossest stupidity, in referring his remarks on contrition and the whole of repentance to the ceremonies of expiation, and by adding, that such expiation is to merit the remission of eternal death.

We hold also that in repentance there is punishment of sin; for the great terror, which is a judgment against our sins, is a far greater punishment than pilgrimages and such jugglery; but this terror has nothing to do with expiation, nor does it merit the remission of sins, or of eternal death, nay, if we were not consoled by faith, this alarm and chastisement would be nothing but sin and death. This is what Augustine teaches concerning punishment. But our adversaries, the great dolts, do not know at all what repentance or contrition is; they are occupied with their jugglery, their rosaries, pilgrimages, and the like.

They say, however, that God, as a righteous judge, must punish sin. Certainly, he punishes sin, when in his wrath, he so greatly distresses and alarms our consciences in their terror, as David says, Psalm 6, 1: "O Lord, rebuke me not in thine anger, neither chasten me in thy hot displeasure." And Jeremiah 10, 24, says: "O Lord, correct me, but with judgment; not in thine anger, lest thou bring me to nothing." Here he surely speaks of great unspeakable anguish; and our adversaries themselves acknowledge, that contrition can be

so deep and violent, as not to require satisfaction. Contrition is, therefore, more certainly a punishment, than expiation or satisfaction.

The saints, moreover, must endure death and all kinds of crosses and afflictions, like others, as Peter says, 1 Pet. 4, 17: "For the time is come, that judgment must begin at the house of God." And although these afflictions are frequently penalties and punishments of sin, yet they are designed for a different purpose in the case of the Christian, namely, to urge and train him to see the weakness of his faith in temptations, and to teach him to turn to God for aid and consolation; as Paul says of himself: "That we were pressed out of measure, above strength, insomuch that we despaired even of life; but we had the sentence of death in ourselves, that we should not trust in ourselves, but in God, which raiseth the dead," 2 Cor. 1, 8, 9. And Isaiah (26, 16,) says: "Lord, in trouble have they visited thee; they poured out a prayer when thy chastening was upon them;" that is, affliction is the paternal discipline which God applies to the saints. Again, God sends afflictions upon us, to mortify and subdue the sins remaining in us, that we may be renewed in spirit, as Paul says, Rom. 8, 10: "The body is dead because of sin;" that is, it will daily be more and more mortified on account of the sins remaining in the flesh; and death itself tends to put down our sinful flesh, and to raise us from the dead altogether holy and renewed.

We are not liberated from these tribulations and penalties by our expiations; therefore it cannot be said that they pass for such crosses and afflictions, and that they remove the temporal punishment of sin; for it is certain that the power of the keys can release or absolve no one from crosses, or other common tribulations. And if they wish the *pœnæ* (by which satisfaction is made) to be understood of common tribulations, how can they teach, that we must make expiation in purgatory?

They allege against us the example of Adam, and of David who was punished on account of his adultery. These examples they set up as a rule, that every sin must have its own temporal punishment, before it is forgiven. We have already stated that Christians suffer tribulations, by which they are disciplined, that they are subject to alarm in their conscience, and to many struggles and trials. Thus God imposes special penalties on some sinners, as an example. With these punishments the power of the keys has nothing to do; it belongs to God alone, to impose and remit them, at his pleasure.

Nor does it at all follow, because a special punishment was inflicted on David, that, besides the common crosses and afflictions of Christians, there is also a purgatorial punishment, in which each sin

receives its proper degree and measure of punishment. For we nowhere read in the Scriptures, that we cannot be redeemed from eternal pain and death, except by means of such sufferings and expiations; but they everywhere testify that we obtain the remission of sins without merit, through Christ, and that Christ alone conquered death and sin; therefore we should not patch our merits upon it. And although Christians must endure all kinds of penalties, chastisements, and tribulations, yet the Scripture shows that these are imposed on us to humble and mortify our old Adamic nature, and not to liberate us from eternal death.

The Scriptures excuse Job, as not being afflicted on account of any evil deed. Hence afflictions and trials are not always evidences of divine wrath; and men should be carefully taught to view them in a far different light, namely, as evidences of favor, and not to think that God has forsaken them, when they are afflicted. The other proper fruits of the cross should be considered, namely, that God lays his hand upon us, and performs a *strange work*, as Isaiah says, (28, 21,) "that he may do his own work" in us,—as he shows in a long, consolatory discourse in his 28th chapter. So, when the disciples enquired concerning the blind man, John 9, 3, Christ answered: "Neither hath this man sinned, nor his parents; but that the works of God should be made manifest in him." And Jeremiah, the prophet, says: "They whose judgment was not to drink of the cup, have assuredly drunken," Jer. 49, 12. Thus the prophets were slain, thus John the baptist, and other saints, were put to death.

Accordingly, afflictions are not always punishments for former sins, but works of God, designed for our benefit, that his power and strength may be more clearly seen in our weakness, and to show that he is able to help even in the midst of death. Thus says Paul, 2 Cor. 12, 9: God's "strength is made perfect in weakness." We ought, therefore, to sacrifice our bodies to the will of God, to manifest our obedience and patience, and not to liberate ourselves from eternal death or everlasting punishment; because, for this purpose, God appointed another remedy, namely, the death of Christ, his Son, our Lord.

In this manner St. Gregory explains the example of David, saying: "If God threatened, on account of that sin, that he should thus be humbled by his son, why did he issue the menace, when the sin was already forgiven? The answer is, that the remission was granted in order that this man might not be prevented from receiving eternal life; nevertheless the threatened punishment followed,

to try him and keep him humble." Thus God also imposed natural death on man, and does not remove it, even when his sins are forgiven, in order that those whose sins are remitted, may be established, and proved, and sanctified.

Now, it is evident that the power of the keys does not remove these common chastisements, such as, wars, famine, and similar calamities; again, that canonical expiations (*canonica satisfactiones*) do not relieve us from these afflictions, so as to save us from them, even when we are guilty of mortal sin. Our adversaries themselves confess, that they do not impose expiations for these common plagues, but for purgatory; hence their expiations are mere fictions and dreams.

But some quote the declaration of Paul, 1 Cor. 11, 31: "For if we would judge ourselves, we should not be judged." From this they infer, that if we impose punishment on ourselves, God will exercise greater clemency in chastising us. Reply:—Paul is here speaking of the reformation of the whole life, and not of external punishment and ceremonies; therefore, this passage has nothing to do with expiations; for, what does God care for punishment without reformation? Yea, it is horrid blasphemy to teach that our expiation, even when made while we are in mortal sin, mitigates the punishments of God. Paul is speaking of contrition and faith, of our entire reformation, not merely of external chastisement. This passage therefore simply means that, if we reform, God will avert his punishment. This is true; nay, it is profitable, consolatory, and necessary to preach, that God mitigates our punishment when we amend our lives, as he did in the case of Nineveh. This is what Isaiah teaches, 1, 18: "Though your sins be as scarlet, they shall be as white as snow," if you amend your lives. Now, this reformation does not consist in canonical expiations, but in other parts of repentance, in contrition, in faith, in good works which follow faith; and yet our adversaries apply these consolatory passages to their false and fantastic views of expiation.

In reference to the fact, that the ancient teachers and Fathers mention expiations, and that the councils made canons concerning them, we have already stated, that they simply were an external ceremony, and that it was not the opinion of the Fathers, that this ceremony of repentance would blot out our guilt before God, or its punishment. Now, although some of the Fathers mention purgatory, yet they themselves say, by way of explanation: Though it exist, yet it is not a liberation from eternal death and punishment, which Christ alone effects; but it is a purification and purgation (as

they say) of imperfect souls. Thus Augustine says: "Daily sins are consumed and wiped out; such as distrust in God, and the like."

The Fathers occasionally use the word *satisfactio*, or expiation, which, as we have said, originally came from the ceremony of public penance, for true contrition and the mortifying of the old Adamic nature. In this manner Augustine says: "True *satisfactio*, or expiation is, to cut off the cause of sin; that is, to mortify the flesh," &c.

Again: "To restrain and mortify the flesh; not that eternal death or punishment is blotted out thereby, but that the flesh may not lead us to sin."

Gregory says with regard to the restitution of the property of others, that our repentance is false, unless we make satisfaction to those whose goods we hold unjustly; for he that continues to steal does not repent that he has stolen; and as long as he retains the goods of others, he is a thief or a robber. The restitution we owe to others, should be made; but it is not necessary here to discuss this *civil satisfaction*, Eph. 4, 28.

Again, the Fathers say, that it is sufficient, once in the whole life to perform the public penance, or repentance, to which the *canones satisfactorum* (canons pertaining to satisfaction) refer. This shows, that they did not believe these canons to be necessary to the remission of sins; for, aside from these ceremonies of public repentance, they frequently speak of Christian repentance, without mentioning the *canones satisfactorum* (canons of expiation).

The stupid writers of the Confutation say, that the abolition of expiations contrary to the express Gospel, cannot be allowed. We have heretofore very clearly shown, that this canonical expiation, that is, the works which (they say) we are not under obligation to do, are not founded in the Scriptures.

This appears from the very nature of the thing; for if we are not bound to perform expiatory works, why do they assert that we teach contrary to the plain Gospel? Now, if it were the doctrine of the Gospel, that such works remove everlasting punishment and death, we would be bound before God to perform them. But they teach these things, for the purpose of deluding the inexperienced, and quote passages from the holy Scripture, which speak of true Christian works that we are in duty bound to do, while they base their expiations on works which we are under no obligation to perform, and which they call *opera non debita*.

They even concede in their schools, that such expiations may be omitted without committing fatal sin. Hence their assertion is false, that the Gospel expressly enjoins these expiations.

We have, moreover, frequently stated, that genuine repentance is always accompanied by good works and fruits, and the Ten Commandments teach what good works really are; namely, sincerely, cordially, and most highly to revere, to fear and love God, to call upon him cheerfully in time of need, to thank him always, to confess his Word, to hear it, to teach and console others with it, to be obedient to our parents and government, to attend to our office and vocation faithfully, to avoid bitterness, hatred, and murder, but to be agreeable and friendly to our neighbors, to assist the poor according to ability, to abstain from fornication and adultery, and in all respects to restrain the flesh. All this is to be done, not to make satisfaction for eternal death or everlasting punishment, which is Christ's office alone; but that we may not give way to Satan, provoke God's anger, and offend the Holy Spirit. God requires these fruits and good works; they are also rewarded, and should be brought forth for the sake of God's honor and commandments.

But, that eternal punishment cannot be remitted, except by expiation in purgatory, or by certain good works of human appointment, is nowhere taught in the holy Scriptures. Public penitents are frequently released by indulgences from the penances and expiations imposed, that they may not be too severely pressed. Now, if men have power to remit expiations and penances, God has not enjoined them; for no man can abolish divine commandments.

But, inasmuch as the ancient custom of public penance and expiation has long since been abolished,—the bishops having permitted this from time to time,—indulgences are unnecessary; and yet this name has continued in the church. Now, as the word *satisfactio* (expiation) has ceased to be understood as an ordinance and a ceremony of the church; so, the term “indulgences” was also misinterpreted as grace and forgiveness, by which souls are redeemed from purgatory; whereas the whole power of the keys extends no farther than to the earth, as the passage says: “Whatsoever thou shalt bind on earth, shall be bound in heaven: and whatsoever thou shalt loose on earth, shall be loosed in heaven,” Matt. 16, 19.

Consequently, the power of the keys has no authority to establish special punishments or services of God; but only to remit the sins of those who repent, and to excommunicate those who do not repent; for to *loose* here signifies to forgive sins; to *bind* means *not to forgive them*. Christ is speaking of a spiritual kingdom, and God has commanded, to release those from sin, who truly repent; as Paul says, 2 Cor. 10, 8: *The Lord has given us authority for edification, and not for your destruction.*

Hence the reservation of certain cases, by the Pope and the bishops, is likewise an outward worldly matter. For it is a reservation of the absolution of canonical punishment, and not of guilt before God. Our adversaries are right, therefore, when they themselves say that in the hour of death, such reservation should not supercede true, Christian absolution.

We have now set forth the substance of our doctrine concerning repentance, and feel assured, that it is not only Christian, but most useful and highly important to pious hearts. If godly, pious, and honorable men will consider this most weighty matter, as it should be, and compare our, nay, Christ's and the apostles doctrine, with the many bungling, confused, puerile dissertations and writings of our adversaries, they will discover that they have altogether omitted the most excellent and needful thing, namely, faith in Christ, without which it is impossible to teach or learn anything good, and through which alone men can be truly comforted. They will likewise perceive many inventions of our adversaries, respecting the merit of attrition, the enumeration of sins, and expiations, all of which are unscriptural, altogether visionary, and not understood by our adversaries themselves.

VII. OF THE SACRAMENTS AND THEIR PROPER USE.

Our adversaries admit our assertion in the thirteenth article, that the Sacraments are not mere signs, by which men recognize each other,—like the countersign, court-livery, &c.,—but efficacious signs and sure testimonies of God's grace and purposes towards us, by which he admonishes and strengthens our hearts to believe the more firmly and joyfully.

But they also want us to acknowledge, that there are seven sacraments, neither more nor less. We answer, that all the ceremonies and sacraments which God instituted in his Word, should be maintained. With respect, however, to the *seven* sacraments, we find that the Fathers differed; consequently these seven ceremonies are not all equally necessary.

If we regard as sacraments the external signs and ceremonies, which God enjoined, and with which he connected the promise of grace, it is easy to determine what are sacraments; for ceremonies and other external things, instituted by men, are not sacraments in this sense; because men cannot promise the grace of God, without divine authority. Signs, therefore, which are instituted without the command of God, are not signs of grace: although they may be memorials to children and to the ignorant, like a painted cross.

Now Baptism, the Eucharist, and Absolution are true sacraments; { for they are commanded of God, and have the promise of grace, which in reality belongs to, and is the New Testament. For the external signs were instituted to move our hearts, namely, both by the word and the external signs, to believe, when we are baptized and when we receive the Lord's body, that God will be truly merciful to us, through Christ, as Paul, Rom. 10, 17, says: "Faith cometh by hearing." As the word enters our ears, so the external signs are placed before our eyes, inwardly to excite and move the heart to faith. The Word and the external signs work the same thing in our hearts; as Augustine well says: "The Sacrament is a visible word;" for the external sign is like a picture, and signifies the same thing that is preached by the Word; both, therefore, effect the same thing. Word Sacrament

But Confirmation and Extreme Unction are ceremonies, derived from the ancient Fathers, which the church never regarded as necessary to salvation, for they are not enjoined by God; it is therefore well to make a distinction between these and the above, which were instituted by the word and command of God, and have his promise appended.

By the sacrament of Ordination, or the Priesthood, our adversaries do not mean the administration of the Word and Sacraments to others, but the offering of sacrifices by priests, as if the New Testament must have an order of priests, like the Levites, to sacrifice for the people, and obtain the remission of sins for others. We teach, that the sacrifice of Christ upon the cross was alone sufficient for the sins of the whole world, and that we need no other sacrifices besides this. We have no order of priests in the new covenant, like the Levitical, as the Epistle to the Hebrews proves. But if the sacrament of ordination were called the sacrament of the ministry, we should not object to calling ordination a sacrament. For the ministry was appointed by God, and glorious promises are connected with it, Rom. 1, 16: "The gospel is the power of God unto salvation, to every one that believeth;" Isaiah 55, 11: "So shall my word be that goeth forth out of my mouth: it shall not return unto me void," &c. If the sacrament of ordination be understood in this way, the imposition of hands could also be called a sacrament. For the church is commanded to appoint ministers and deacons. Now, as it is a great consolation to know that God preaches and works through men, and those appointed by them, we should highly applaud and venerate such appointment, especially against the wicked Anabaptists, who despise and rail against such appointment; as well as against the ministry and the external word.

The state of matrimony was not first instituted in the New Testament; but soon after man was created; and it was enjoined of God; besides, there are also divine promises connected with it, which do not properly belong to the New Testament, but rather concern the physical life. Now, if any one chooses to call it a sacrament, we shall not seriously object; but it should be separated from the *former two*, which are in fact signs and seals of the New Testament. If the state of matrimony is to be called a sacrament, merely because God instituted and enjoined it, the other offices and estates ordained in the Word of God, such as government, magistracy, &c., should also be called sacraments.

And finally, if men feel disposed to attach the glorious title of sacrament to all these things, because they are enjoined by the Word of God, they should, above all, apply that name to prayer; for it is forcibly commanded of God, and many noble, divine promises accompany it. And there would seem to be reason for it too; for so great a name would stimulate men to prayer.

Alms might likewise be placed among sacraments, and the crosses and afflictions of Christians; for, to these the promises of God are also added. But no intelligent man will lay great stress upon the number of sacraments, whether seven or more; provided only that the word and command of God be maintained.

It is, however, more important for us to discuss and understand the *proper use* of the Sacraments. Here we must freely condemn all the scholastics and their false doctrines, that those who simply use the sacraments, and do not oppose their operation, obtain, *ex opere operato*, the grace of God, even if the heart at the time has no good emotions. But it is clearly a Jewish error to hold that we are justified by works and external ceremonies, without faith, and although the heart be not engaged therein; yet this pernicious doctrine is preached and promulgated far and wide through all the Papal territory and churches.

Paul, (Rom. 4, 9-11,) denies that Abraham was justified through circumcision, and asserts that it was a sign appointed to exercise and strengthen faith. We therefore say, that the proper use of the Sacraments requires faith, to believe the divine promises, and receive the promised grace, which is offered through the Sacraments and the Word. Now this is the obvious and proper use of the holy Sacraments, upon which our hearts and our minds can firmly rely. For the divine promises can be accepted through faith alone. Now, as the Sacraments are external signs and seals of the promises, their proper use requires faith; for when we receive the sacrament of the

body and blood of Christ, Christ clearly says: "This cup is the new testament," Luke 22, 20. We should firmly believe then, that the grace and remission of sins, promised in the New Testament, are imparted to us. Now we should receive this in faith, and thereby console our alarmed, timid hearts, and rest assured, that the Word and promises of God cannot fail, but are as sure, nay, more so, than a new divine voice, or a new miracle from heaven, promising grace to us. But what would miracles benefit us, if they were not believed? Here we are speaking of special faith, namely, the belief that our own sins are surely forgiven, and not of *general* faith, believing that there is a God. This proper use of the Sacraments really consoles and refreshes the heart.

We cannot, however, too carefully consider, or speak too freely of the abuses and errors, introduced by the pernicious, shameful, and impious doctrine of the *opus operatum*, namely, that the mere use of the Sacraments, the work performed, makes us just before God, and secures his grace, even without a good disposition of the heart. Hence originated the unspeakable and abominable abuse of the mass. They cannot show a particle of proof from the writings of the ancient Fathers, to support the opinions of the scholastics. Nay, Augustine says, directly to the contrary, that it is not the Sacraments that justify, but *faith* in their use, justifies us in the sight of God.

The fourteenth article, in which we say, that no one should be permitted to preach, or to administer the Sacraments in the church, except those only who are duly called, they accept, provided that we mean by this the call of priests, who are ordained or consecrated according to the canons. On this subject, we have several times declared in this convention, that we are most willing to assist in maintaining the old ecclesiastical regulations, and episcopal government, which is called *canonica polítia*, provided the bishops would tolerate our doctrine, and receive our priests.

But the bishops have hitherto persecuted and murdered our ministers contrary to their own laws. Nor have we as yet been able to induce them to desist from this tyranny. Our opponents are, therefore, to blame that the bishops are not obeyed, and we are excused before God and all pious men. For since the bishops will not tolerate our divines, unless they reject the doctrine which we profess, and which we are bound before God to confess and maintain, we cannot recognize the bishops, and prefer to obey God, knowing that the Christian church is, wherever the Word of God is correctly taught. Let the bishops see to it, how they can answer for the distraction and devastation of the churches, by such tyranny.

VIII. OF HUMAN ORDINANCES IN THE CHURCH.

Our adversaries agree to the first part of the fifteenth article, in which we say, that the ceremonies and ordinances which can be kept conscientiously, without sin, and promote order and tranquillity, should be observed in the church. The other part they condemn, in which we assert, that the ordinances established to reconcile God and to obtain the remission of sins, are directly opposed to the Gospel. Although in our Confession, in regard to diversity of meats, we have said a great deal respecting ordinances, yet we must here briefly repeat it.

True, we supposed that our adversaries would seek by other arguments, to sustain these human ordinances, but we hardly thought that they would condemn this article, namely, that human traditions cannot merit the remission of sins. But, as this whole article is insolently condemned by them, we shall find no difficulty in replying. For this is evidently a Jewish principle; it is, in fact, a suppression of the Gospel by the doctrine of the devil. For the holy Scriptures, and Paul especially, call such ordinances the genuine doctrine of the devil, when men extol them as means to obtain the remission of sins. For in this light, they are as directly opposed to Christ and to the Gospel, as fire and water are opposed to each other.

The Gospel teaches that through faith in Christ, without merit, we obtain the forgiveness of sins, and are reconciled to God; but our adversaries set up another mediator, namely, human laws. By these they would obtain the remission of sins, and by these appease the wrath of God; but Christ clearly says: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. 15, 9.

We have abundantly shown above, that we are justified before God by faith, when we believe that God is merciful to us, not through our works, but through Christ. Now, there can be no doubt that this is the pure doctrine of the Gospel; for Paul expressly says, Eph. 2, 8, 9: "By grace are ye saved, through faith; and that not of yourselves; it is the gift of God; not of works." But our adversaries say, that men merit the remission of sins by these human ordinances and works. What is this but substituting another mediator and reconciler for Christ?

Paul says, Gal. 5, 4: "Whosoever of you are justified by the law: ye are fallen from grace;" that is, if you believe that you are justified before God, by the law, Christ is of no benefit to you. For what need of Christ the Mediator have those, who expect to reconcile God by the works of the law? God has offered *Christ*, because

he would be gracious unto us for the sake of his mediation, and not on account of our righteousness. But they maintain, that their works and these traditions secure the mercy of God. In this manner they rob Christ of his honor ; and there is no difference between the ceremonies of the law of Moses and such traditions, so far as this matter is concerned. Paul rejects the ceremonies of Moses for the same reason that he rejects the commandments of men ; namely, because the Jews held them to be works meriting the remission of sins ; for thus Christ was suppressed. He, therefore, rejects alike the works of the law and human commandments, and contends that the remission of sins is promised, not on account of our works, but for the sake of Christ, without merit ; yet so, as that we receive it by faith, because the promises cannot be received otherwise than by faith.

Now, if by faith, we obtain forgiveness of sins and the mercy of God for Christ's sake, it is a gross error and blasphemy to suppose, that we obtain the remission of sins by such ordinances.

If they should say, that we do not obtain the remission of sins by such works, but that, after we have received forgiveness through faith, we must by such works merit the grace of God, this would be opposed to Paul's declaration, Gal. 2, 17 : " But if, while we seek to be justified by Christ, we ourselves also are found sinners, is therefore Christ the minister of sin ? " Again, Gal. 3, 15 : " Though it be but a man's covenant, yet if it be confirmed, no man disannulleth or addeth thereto. " Therefore, no one should add any thing to the covenant of God, in which he promises to be gracious unto us for Christ's sake ; nor attach to it the error, that we first merit the grace of God by these works.

Now, if we should establish or select such works, to appease God, and to merit the remission of sins, how could we be certain that these works are acceptable to God, without their being enjoined of God ? How could we assure men of their true relation to God, or that these works are pleasing to him, when there is no divine commandment to this effect ?

The prophets every where forbid the institution of self-devised particular services to God, without his word or command. Ezek. 20, 18, 19 : " Walk ye not in the statutes of your fathers, neither observe their judgments, nor defile yourselves with their idols. I am the Lord your God ; walk in my statutes, and keep my judgments, and do them. " If men have authority to institute services to God, in order to compensate for our sins, and to justify us in the sight of God, all the services of the heathen, and all the idolatry of every

impious king of Israel, of Jeroboam, and others, are commendable ; for there can be no difference. If men are authorized to establish services unto God, meriting salvation, why should the self-elected religious services of the heathens and Israelites, be unholy ? These services were rejected, because they believed them to be pleasing to God, and knew nothing of his highest service, which is faith.

Again, how do we know that such services and works, unauthorized by the Word of God, justify us in his sight, as no man is able to ascertain or know the will of God, except through his Word ? What if God dispises and abominates such services ! how dare our adversaries say, that they justify man in the sight of God ? Without the Word of God, no one can assert this. Paul says to the Romans 14, 23 : " Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." Inasmuch, then, as these services have no divine authority, our hearts must remain in doubt whether they are acceptable to God.

But why need we waste many words on a point so clear ? If our opponents defend these services as works meriting the remission of sins and salvation, they clearly establish the doctrine and kingdom of Antichrist, for his kingdom really is a new service of this kind, devised by men, and suppressing Christ ; like the Mahometan religion with its self-elected services and human works, by which its followers suppose they become holy and pious before God, not believing that man is justified by faith alone in Christ.

Thus, Popery also becomes a part of the kingdom of Antichrist, when it teaches, that we obtain the forgiveness of sins, and are reconciled with God, through human ordinances ; for Christ is deprived of his honor, when they teach, that we are not justified through Christ, without merit, by faith, but through such services ; and especially when they tell us that such self-appointed services are not only useful but necessary ; as they maintain in the eighth article above, where they condemn our assertion, that the true unity of the church does not require human ordinances to be every where uniform.

Thus, Daniel describes the kingdom of Antichrist, showing that such new services, established by men, will be its *politia*, its true form and character ; for says he : " But in his estate shall he honor the God of forces ; and a god whom his fathers knew not shall he honor with gold and silver, and with precious stones, and pleasant things," Dan. 11, 38. Here he describes these new services ; for he is speaking of a god of whom the fathers knew nothing.

✓ Although the holy Fathers also had ceremonies and ordinances, yet they did not believe that these were useful and necessary to sal-

vation, nor suppress Christ by them; but they taught that God is gracious to us for Christ's sake, and not on account of these services. But they observed these ordinances to exercise the body, for instance, the festivals, in order that the people might know when to come together, that everything might be done orderly and decently in the churches, as a good example, and that the multitude might be kept under good parental discipline. For such particular seasons, and various services, are calculated to keep the people in good discipline, and to remind them of the gospel history. For these reasons the Fathers observed human regulations.

Thus are we also in favor of observing good customs; but we are truly surprised that our adversaries teach, contrary to all the writings of the Apostles, and contrary to the Old and New Testaments, that through such services we are to obtain the remission of sins and eternal salvation. For what is this but, as Daniel says, honoring God with gold, silver, and precious stones? that is, to believe that God is propitiated through various church ornaments, banners, and tapers; of which there are an infinite variety among these human ordinances.

Paul writes to the Colossians 2, 23, that *such ordinances have a show of wisdom*. And, indeed, they have a strong semblance of holiness; for disorder is unseemly, and good parental discipline is useful in the church. But inasmuch as human reason does not know what faith is, those judging according to their reason, at once conclude that it secures heaven for us, and reconciles us to God.

Thus did errors and the evils of idolatry insinuate themselves among the Israelites; hence they established numberless services, as in our day altars and churches are so rapidly increasing.

Thus human reason judges also of other bodily exercises, such as fasts, &c.; for they tend to restrain the old Adamic nature. But reason soon conceives that they reconcile us to God; as Thomas says: "Fasting is efficacious in removing our guilt before God, and afterwards preventing it." These are the very words of Thomas. Thus these very plausible services make a great display, and have a strong semblance of holiness before the people. And they encourage this error by referring to the examples of the saints, when they say: "Francis wore a cap," &c. In these things, they regard only the external exercise; not the heart and faith.

Now, when the people are deceived by this great and pompous display of holiness, the consequence is unspeakable danger and evil; the knowledge of Christ and the Gospel is neglected, and their whole confidence is placed on such works. Moreover, the really good works, which God requires in the Ten Commandments, are (it grieves

us to say,) wholly suppressed by such hypocritical acts; for it seems that these alone are called spiritual, holy, and perfect life, and are preferred far above the genuine, holy, good works which each one is bound, by the law of God, to perform, as, for example, the fulfilment of our vocation, the faithful and diligent administration of government, Christian discipline in our family and domestic relations. These are not regarded as divine, but worldly works; and consequently many have been greatly troubled in their conscience; for it is known, that some have abandoned their principalities, and others wedlock, to enter into cloisters, for the purpose of becoming holy and spiritual.

Besides, the evil is connected with this error, that when men imagine that such ordinances are necessary to salvation, their consciences are continually harassed with disquietude and torment, because they have not strictly observed the rules of their orders, their monastic rites, and the works imposed upon them; for who is able to state all these ordinances? There are books without number, in which not a word is said of Christ, of faith, or of truly good works enjoined of God, and which each one is bound to do by his calling; but they confine their remarks to such ordinances as, forty days fasting, the hearing of masses, canonical seasons for prayer, &c.; indeed there is no end to their interpretations and dispensations.

How greatly was the good and pious Gerson tormented by these things! how he labored and strained, to afford men true consolation, when he sought out grades and latitudes in the precepts, for the purpose of determining to what extent these commandments were binding! and yet he was unable to discover any certain limit, at which he could assure the heart of peace and security. He, therefore, complained most bitterly of the great danger to the conscience by requiring an observance of these ordinances, even in the case of mortal sin.

But, against such hypocritical and delusive ordinances, by which many are unnecessarily misled and tormented, we should fortify and strengthen ourselves by the Word of God, and in the first place confidently trust, that the remission of sins is not merited by such ordinances. We have already quoted the Apostle to the Colossians: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day, or of the new-moon, or of the sabbath-days," Col. 2, 16. And the Apostle means the whole law of Moses, together with these traditions; our adversaries, therefore, cannot as usual evade the force of this passage, by claiming that Paul spoke only of the law of Moses. But he clearly shows that he also means human ordi-

nances ; our adversaries, however, do not know what they say. If the Gospel and Paul clearly state, that even the ceremonies and works of the law of Moses are of no avail before God, human ordinances will be much less so.

The bishops, therefore, have no authority or power to establish self-elected services to God to make men holy and righteous before God ; for the Apostles, Acts 15, 10, say : “ Why tempt ye God, to put a yoke upon the neck of the disciple ? ” &c. Here Peter calls it a great sin, by which men blaspheme and tempt God. Hence the Apostles mean to say that the church should remain free in these matters,—that no ceremonies, either of the law of Moses or other ordinances, shall be considered necessary services to God, as were certain ceremonies of the law of Moses, for a time, under the Old Testament dispensation. We must, therefore, contend that the preaching of grace, of Christ, and of the remission of sins by grace alone, be not suppressed, and oppose the error that these ordinances are necessary to justify us in the sight of God.

Gerson and many other pious and faithful men, being moved to compassion by the great danger into which the soul is thus placed, in vain sought, in this way, to give *επιουσιαν*, or relief to the conscience from the various tormenting influences of these traditions. But the holy Scripture and the Apostles have made short work of it, and completely blotted out the whole with one stroke, plainly saying that in Christ we are free from all traditions, especially those through which men seek to obtain salvation and the remission of sins. The Apostles, therefore, teach us to resist this pernicious Pharisaic doctrine, by our teachings and example.

Hence we teach that such ordinances do not justify us in the sight of God, that they are not necessary to salvation, and that no one should establish or receive them, with a view to be justified by them before God. But let those who wish to observe them, keep them as they do any civil custom, without expecting by them to be justified before God, just as those living in Germany or Italy dress according to the prevailing custom simply to comply with the custom of the country, but not to be saved by it.

The Apostles, as the Gospel shows, boldly violated such ordinances, and Christ commended them for it. For it was necessary to show to the Pharisees, not only by doctrine and preaching, but also by actions, that such services to God are useless to salvation. Our divines are therefore abundantly justified for omitting some traditions and ceremonies ; for the bishops require them as necessary to salvation,—an error that cannot be tolerated.

But the most ancient ordinances in the church, as, for instance, the three chief festivals, Sunday, and the like, which were established for the sake of order, union, and peace, we cheerfully observe. Our ministers also speak of them to the people, with great respect; declaring, however, that they do not justify man before God. Hence the violent language of our adversaries, who do us gross injustice in the sight of God, by accusing us of abolishing and suppressing all good ceremonies and regulations in the church. For we can assert with truth, that the proper service of God is observed in our churches, in a more Christian and decent spirit, than among our adversaries. Pious, honorable, intelligent, and impartial men, who carefully examine this matter, know that the old canons and *mens legis* (the spirit of the law) are observed by us, more fully, purely, and diligently, than by our adversaries. For our opponents shamelessly trample under foot the most excellent canons, as well as Christ and the Gospel. In their convents, the priests and monks abuse the mass in the most awful and abominable manner, holding masses daily in great numbers, simply for the sake of money and base gratification. They sing Psalms in the convents, not for the sake of study, or of sincere prayer, (for the greater part do not understand a solitary verse in the Psalms,) but they attend to their matins and vespers as to hired services, for the sake of the income they afford. They cannot deny any of these things. Indeed, some honest men among them feel ashamed of this traffic, and say the clergy need a reformation.

Among us, the people willingly and freely partake of the holy Sacrament every Sunday, after being examined in Christian doctrine, in the Lord's Prayer, the Creed, and the Ten Commandments. The youth and the people also, regularly sing Latin and German Psalms, in order that they may become acquainted with the Scriptures, and learn to pray. Among our adversaries there is no catechising, although the canons require it. The canons, enjoining it upon pastors and ministers of the church publicly and privately to instruct the children and youth in the Word of God, are kept among us; and catechising is not a childish thing like the bearing of banners and candles, but a very useful instruction.

Among our adversaries there is no preaching in many countries, (as in Italy, Spain, &c.) during the whole year, except only in Lent. This gives them just cause for loud complaint; for this is at once subverting all divine worship. The most eminent, holy, useful, and exalted service, which God has required in the first and second commandments, is the preaching of his Word; for the office of the preacher is the highest in the church. How, then, can the knowledge

The highest office in the Church

of God, the doctrine of Christ, or the Gospel prevail, where this service is omitted? And even when they preach during Lent or at other times, they dwell only on human ordinances, the invocation of saints, holy water, and the like foolish works; and their people are in the habit, soon after the text of the Gospel is read, of going out of the churches; which practice perhaps originated from their unwillingness to hear the falsehoods which were to follow. Some few of them now begin to preach of good works; but of the knowledge of Christ, of faith, and of the consolation of the conscience, they cannot preach; on the contrary, they call this blessed doctrine, this precious holy Gospel, Lutheranism.

But in our churches, our ministers assiduously inculcate the following important subjects: namely, true repentance, the fear of God, faith and its nature, the knowledge of Christ, and the righteousness which comes from faith. They teach also how we should seek consolation in anxiety and trials; how faith is to be exercised by all kinds of trials; what true prayer is, and how we should pray. They maintain, that the Christian should confidently trust that God in heaven hears his cries and prayers; they speak of the holy cross, of obedience to the government, and teach how each one in his station may live and act as a Christian; they enjoin obedience to the commands of rulers, to temporal order and law; they instruct the people how to distinguish between the spiritual kingdom of Christ and the civil governments of the world, show them the nature of matrimony and the Christian duties connected with it, enforce the Christian training of children, chastity, and the exercise of love to our neighbors. This is the doctrinal and moral character of our church. Impartial men can easily perceive, that we do not abolish proper Christian ceremonies, but preserve them most faithfully.

As to the mortification of the flesh, or of the old Adamic nature, we teach, as our Confession declares, that such mortification truly takes place, when God breaks our will, and sends crosses and afflictions upon us to teach us obedience to his will, as Paul says, Rom. 12, 1: "Present your bodies a living sacrifice, holy, acceptable unto God." This is in truth holy mortification, thus to learn to know, fear, and love God in our trials.

Besides these tribulations, which are not subject to our will, there are also bodily exercises, to which Christ refers, saying: "Take heed to yourselves, lest at any time your hearts be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness," Luke 21, 34. Paul says also: "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection," &c., 1 Cor. 9, 27. These exercises should be performed, not as necessary services that

justify us before God, but for the purpose of keeping our flesh under restraint, that we may not "be overcharged with surfeiting and drunkenness," become secure and idle, and follow the allurements of the devil and the lusts of the flesh. This fasting and mortification should be attended to, not only at fixed times, but continually. For God desires us always to live moderately and temperately; and, as experience shows, the prescribing of many fast days does not lead to this. For more extravagance and gluttony have been practised with fish and various fast-meats, than out of the season of fasting. Nor did our adversaries themselves ever observe the fasts, as they are laid down in the canons.

Many and difficult controversies and inquiries are connected with this article on human traditions or ordinances, and experience has shown but too plainly, that they are most severe fetters, and an awful torture to the soul. For, when the error prevails that they are necessary to salvation, they torment the soul beyond measure; as the pious know it to be, when they omit a part of the canonical exercises, or otherwise act contrary to them. But the propriety of inculcating absolute liberty in these things, is also a serious and difficult question, for the people at large need external discipline and instruction.

But our adversaries themselves render this subject easy, and simple; for they condemn us, because we teach that we do not merit, by human ordinances, the remission of sins before God. Again, they want their ordinances to be observed (universally) in all the churches, as necessary, and put them in the place of Christ.

On this point we have a strong advocate, the apostle Paul, who every where maintains, that such ordinances do not justify us in the sight of God, and are not necessary to salvation.

And our divines clearly and explicitly teach, that we should so use our Christian liberty in these things, that no offence be given to the weak who are not enlightened in these things, and that those, who abuse this liberty, may not deter weak brethren from the doctrine of the Gospel. Our preachers teach therefore, that without special and urgent cause, no change should be made in church usages, and that for the sake of peace and harmony we should observe the customs that are not in themselves sinful or oppressive. And at the Diet of Augsburg we clearly stated that for the sake of love, we were willing, with others, to hold certain *adiaphora* (things indifferent); for we were well persuaded, that general union and peace, so far as they can be maintained without offence to the conscience, should be preferred to all minor things. But we shall, hereafter,

speak more fully of all these things, when we come to treat of *monastic vows* and the *power of the church*.

Our adversaries take no exception to the sixteenth article of our Confession, which declares that a Christian may, with a good conscience, hold civil offices, exercise authority, pronounce judgment, and decide cases according to statute and common law, inflict capital and other severe punishment, go to war, make lawful contracts, hold property, make oath when required by the magistrate: in short, to the article in which we say that the magistracy and government, their rights and punishment, and all that pertains to them, are good and divine institutions, in which the Christian may lawfully engage. Our adversaries are well pleased with this declaration.

This most weighty, important article, concerning the distinction between the spiritual kingdom of Christ and temporal authority, which it is highly necessary to understand, is most faithfully and explicitly set forth by our friends, evidently to the great consolation of many souls.

For, we have clearly taught that the church of Christ is a spiritual kingdom, in which he reigns through the Word and preaching, operates through the Holy Ghost, and increases faith, piety, love, and patience in our hearts, and here on earth begins God's kingdom and eternal life in us. But while this life endures, he permits us, nevertheless, to use the laws, the ordinances, and estates of this world, according to our various callings, even as he permits us the use of medicine, architecture, agriculture, air, and water.

Nor does the Gospel introduce new laws into temporal government, but commands and requires us to be obedient to the laws and to our government, whether it be heathen or Christian, and by such obedience to manifest our love. For Carlstadt in this respect acted most unwisely, in teaching that the temporal government should be arranged according to the law of Moses.

On this subject we have written the more, because the monks had spread many most pernicious errors in the church; for, to hold no property, to inflict no punishment, and take no revenge, to have no wife and children, they called an *evangelic life*. These doctrines wholly suppressed the pure Gospel, so that it was not at all understood what is Christian, or what the spiritual kingdom of Christ is; they intermingled the worldly and spiritual kingdom, from which resulted many evils, and seditious, ruinous doctrines. For the Gospel does not abrogate temporal government, nor domestic, commercial, or other civil regulations; but rather sustains the public authorities and their government, and commands us to obey them

512
43

as the ordinances of God, not merely from fear of punishment, but for conscience' sake.

Julian the apostate, Celsus, and some others, charged against the Christians, that the Gospel distracts and unsettles temporal government and policy, because it forbids vengeance and the like. These questions also gave Origen, Gregory Nazianzen, and some others, much trouble; although it is easy to answer them, if we but know that the gospel doctrine makes no new laws for worldly governments, but preaches the remission of sins, and proclaims that the spiritual kingdom and eternal life begin in the hearts of believers.

But the Gospel, so far from interfering with these temporal institutions, governments, and ordinances, requires us to obey them, even as in this life we must submit to the common course of nature as the order of God, letting the seasons come and go, without interfering with the spiritual kingdom.

The Gospel forbids only personal vengeance, and the usurpation of the authority of the magistracy; and Christ so frequently inculcates this, that the Apostles may not think of becoming worldly lords, and of taking the kingdoms and authority of those who were ruling at that time, as the Jews thought concerning the kingdom of the Messiah; but that they might know it to be their duty to preach of the spiritual kingdom, and not to change any worldly government. Accordingly, when Christ forbids personal vengeance, it is not only counsel, but an earnest command that he gives, Matt. 5, 39, and Rom. 12, 19.

Public vengeance, however, and the punishment of offences on the part of the magistrates, so far from being forbidden, are rather commanded here; *for it is the work of God*, as Paul says, Rom. 13, 2-5. This vengeance is taken, when criminals are punished, when war is waged for the sake of general peace, when the sword, and horse, and armor are used. On these subjects some teachers have advanced such baneful errors, that nearly all the princes, lords, knights, and servants, began to regard their lawful calling as worldly, ungodly, and worthy of condemnation. What unspeakable danger and injury resulted to souls therefrom! They taught the Gospel and Christian doctrine as if they were nothing but monasticism, not perceiving that the Gospel teaches how we are released from sin, hell, and Satan, before God and in our conscience, and that it does not interfere with the civil government in external things.

The doctrine also, which they have unblushingly advanced, that Christian perfection consists in being destitute of property, is altogether false and delusive. For Christian perfection does not consist

in the display of piety, and separation from worldly affairs ; but faith and the true fear of God in the heart, is such perfection. Abraham, David, and Daniel held royal rank, great princely councils and offices, and possessed great wealth ; yet they were more holy and perfect than any monk or Carthusian friar ever was.

The monks however, especially the Cordeliers, (Franciscans,) made a great display before the people, but no one could learn therefrom in what true holiness consists. For how eminently evangelical and holy did the monks deem men to be, simply for holding no possessions and being voluntarily poor ? But these are most pernicious doctrines, of which the Scriptures know nothing, and which they directly oppose. In the Ten Commandments God clearly says : "Thou shalt not steal." Now here he evidently permits each one to hold property.

On this subject Wickliffe madly insisted that no bishop or pastor should own property. So we find innumerable, complicated disputations on contracts, concerning which it is impossible ever to pacify the Christian's conscience, unless he be instructed on this important point, that Christians may with a good conscience, act according to the laws and customs of the land. For many consciences are relieved by our teaching that contracts are lawful before God, so far as they accord with the common laws and usages, they being equivalent to statutes.

This very important article, concerning the magistracy and civil laws, is very clearly and correctly set forth by our divines, so that many exalted and excellent men, whose calling it is to govern and manage important affairs, acknowledge that they have received great consolation, whereas, before, in consequence of these false doctrines of the monks, they had suffered the greatest anguish, and were in doubt whether their calling accorded with Christianity.

We have made these statements, in order that strangers, foes as well as friends, might understand that, by this doctrine, the magistracy, political government, imperial laws, and the like, are not overthrown, but rather exalted and defended, and that this doctrine truly shows that the administration of the government is a great and glorious office, full of Christian, good works. All this, in consequence of the hypocritical doctrines of the monks, had heretofore been regarded as a sinful, worldly calling and life, to the unspeakable danger of the conscience. The monks devised this hypocrisy ; they exalted their humility and poverty far above the calling of princes and lords, of father and mother, and of the head of the

family; although all these are authorized by the Word of God, while monachism is not.

ad. xvii. Our adversaries accept the seventeenth article, in which we acknowledge, that Christ shall come on the last day, raise up the dead, and give unto the pious eternal life and joy, but condemn the wicked to everlasting punishment with the devil.

ad. xviii. Our opponents also accept the eighteenth article, concerning free-will, although they quote some passages of Scripture, which are not applicable to the subject; they also loudly protest against overrating the freedom of the will as the Pelagians do; and against its depreciation in the manner of the Manichæans. All this is very well said; but what is the difference between the Pelagians and our adversaries, while they both teach that, without the aid of the Holy Spirit, man can love God and keep his commandments, *quoad substantiam actuum?* that is to say, man is able to do such works by the power of natural reason, without the agency of the Holy Ghost, and thereby merits the grace of God.

How incalculable are the errors which grow out of these Pelagian doctrines! and yet they most zealously inculcate them in their schools. Augustine violently opposes these false doctrines on the authority of Paul, whose views we set forth above in treating of justification. We also affirm, that man has freewill to a certain extent; for, in the things that are within the scope of reason, our will is free. We are able, in some measure, to lead an honorable external life,—to speak of God, to practise external worship and forms, to obey parents and superiors, to abstain from theft and murder.

For, as after the fall of Adam, natural reason still remains, and enables us to perceive good and evil in matters within the scope of our senses and reason, so we also have, to some extent, freedom of will to live honorably or dishonorably. The holy Scriptures call this the righteousness of the law, or of the flesh, which reason can in some measure attain, without the Holy Ghost; but yet the inborn unholy lust is so powerful, that men more frequently follow it, than the dictates of reason; and the devil, who, as Paul says, (Eph. 2, 2,) powerfully influences the ungodly, constantly incites our poor, feeble nature to all manner of sin.

And this is the ground why but few, even according to natural reason, lead an honorable life, as we see that but few philosophers, notwithstanding their zealous exertions, have led such a life. Now, it is a gross fiction to say that those who perform these works without grace, are without sin, or that such good works *de congruo* merit the forgiveness of sins and the grace of God. For those who have not the

Holy Ghost, are destitute of the fear of God, of faith, and of confidence; they do not believe that God hears them, that he forgives their sins, that he assists them in the time of need; they are therefore ungodly.

Now, "a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit," Matt. 7, 18; and "without faith it is impossible to please God," Heb. 11, 6; therefore, even admitting that we are capable of performing such external works, we still affirm that the freewill and the reason of man have no ability *in spiritual matters*; that is, truly to believe in God and confidently to trust that he is near us, that he hears us, forgives our sins, &c. For these are the true, noble, and exalted good works of the first table in the Decalogue, which no man can perform without the light and grace of the Holy Spirit; as Paul says, 1 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God;" that is, without being enlightened by the Spirit of God, man cannot have the slightest conception, in his natural reason, of the will of God or divine things.

And men can perceive this, when they ask their hearts how they are disposed towards God's will, and whether they entertain the assurance that God observes and hears them. For, it is difficult even for saints, firmly to believe this, and implicitly to rely upon the invisible God, and, as Peter (1 Pet. 1, 8,) says, to revere and love Christ whom we do not see; how then can it be easy for the ungodly? For we begin to exercise true faith, when our hearts have been alarmed and are comforted again through Christ, when we are born anew through the Holy Ghost, as shown above.

It is proper, therefore, to make this clear distinction, namely, that our reason and freewill enable us, to some extent, to live outwardly honest, but that the new birth, and the formation of a new heart and mind in us, is solely the work of the Holy Ghost. Thus external civil discipline is preserved; for unbecoming, unbridled, and shameless conduct is incompatible with the will of God; and yet a proper distinction is thus made between outward worldly piety, and piety before God, which is not philosophical nor external, but in the heart.

This distinction has not been devised by us, but the holy Scriptures clearly make it. Augustine takes the same view, and recently also William of Paris in numerous essays. This important doctrine, however, has been shamefully suppressed by those who fancy that men can keep the law of God, without the Holy Ghost, and that the latter grants us grace in consideration of our merit.

Our adversaries do not object to the nineteenth article, in which we teach that although God alone has created the whole world and

all nature, and continually preserves all creatures, yet he is not the cause of sin; but that it is the evil will in devils and men, which turns away from God; as Christ says of the devil, John 8, 44: "When the devil speaketh a lie, he speaketh of his own."

In regard to the twentieth article, they say in plain terms:—That they reject and condemn our doctrine, which declares that men do not merit the remission of their sins by good works. Let each one carefully observe that it is *this* article they expressly reject and condemn. What need is there, then, of wasting words on this evident point? The illustrious doctors and framers of the Confutation, clearly show here by what spirit they are moved. For this is by no means an unimportant point in the Christian church, but rather the chief article, namely, that we obtain the remission of our sins, without our own merit, through Christ, and that he is the propitiation for our sins, not our works; as Peter says, Acts 10, 43: "To him give all the prophets witness, that through his name, whosoever believeth in him shall receive remission of sins."

This strong testimony of all the holy prophets may justly be termed a decree of the universal Christian church. For even a single prophet is great in the estimation of God, and a most precious treasure. We should, moreover, rather believe the unanimous voice of this holy church and all the prophets, than the ungodly, wicked sophists, who framed the Confutation, and so shamelessly blasphemed Christ. For, although some teachers asserted in reference to this subject, that after our sins are forgiven, we obtain grace, not through faith, but through our own works; yet they did not maintain that we obtain the remission of sin on account of our works; and not for Christ's sake.

It is, therefore, horrible blasphemy thus to give the honor of Christ to our human works. And we confidently trust to the exalted, noble virtue of his Imperial Majesty and other Princes, that, had they been apprized of it, they would not, in any way, have admitted into the Confutation things so evidently false and unfounded, blaspheming God and the Gospel before all the world. To prove the divine origin of this article, and its holy, heavenly truth, we could adduce numberless passages from the Scriptures, and from the writings of the Fathers. And there is scarcely a word or a page in the principal books of Holy Writ, which does not clearly state this. We have above dwelt largely on these subjects; and godly, pious men, who know why Christ was given, and who would not, for all the riches and kingdoms of the earth, lose Christ, our only Treasure, our only Mediator and Reconciler, must be shocked and alarmed at this mani-

fest contempt and condemnation of the holy word and truth of God by presumptuous man. The prophet Isaiah 53, 6, says: "The Lord hath laid on him the iniquity of us all." But our adversaries would make Isaiah and the whole Bible liars, by saying that the Lord laid our sins on us, and on our works and beggarly expiation. I shall, however, take no notice of their puerile works, their rosaries, pilgrimages, and the like.

We are well aware of the severe Mandate and Imperial Edict issued against us and our doctrine; and we should certainly feel alarmed thereat, if our cause were unimportant or doubtful. But, God be praised! the divine Word gives our hearts the fullest assurance before God, that our adversaries condemn the plain truth of God, the genuine Gospel, the blessed and holy doctrine, without which the Christian church cannot exist, and which every Christian, to the extent and at the peril of life, is bound to acknowledge, maintain, and defend to the honor of God. We shall, therefore, not permit ourselves to be driven from this wholesome doctrine. For who does not wish to depart from this world, in the confession of the doctrine that we obtain the remission of our sins through faith, by the blood of Christ, without our own merit and works!

Experience shows, and the monks themselves must confess, that conscience cannot be quieted or pacified except through faith in Christ; nor can men obtain true and abiding consolation in the severe agonies and trials of death, against the great terrors of death and sin, unless they cleave to the promises of grace in Christ. And they can have no enduring consolation against the devil, who, then especially, severely presses the soul, fills it with terror, incites it to despair, and in an instant, with a single blast, sweeps away all their works like dust, unless they firmly cling to the gospel doctrine that we obtain the remission of sin, without merit, by the precious blood of Christ. For faith alone revives and supports us in the great struggle and agonies of death, when no creature can aid us, when we must die, and be separated from this whole visible creation, and transferred to another state and another world.

This doctrine, then, is certainly worthy of notice, and for its sake every Christian should most cheerfully risk his all. All those who adhere to this Confession of ours, have no occasion to be alarmed or perplexed; let them joyfully trust in God and in Jesus the Lord Christ, and with all cheerfulness venture to confess this evident truth against all the world, all tyranny, wrath, menaces, and terrors, even in the face of all the tyrannical murder and persecution taking place every day. For who can suffer himself to be deprived of this great,

may, eternal consolation, on which the entire welfare of the whole Christian church depends !

If we take up the Bible and seriously read it, we soon discover that this doctrine is founded everywhere in the Scripture. Paul clearly says, Rom. 3, 24, and 4, 16, that sin is forgiven without merit, for the sake of Christ ; he therefore tells us : *We are justified through faith without merit, that the promise might be sure ;* that is to say : if the promise depended on our works, it would not be sure. If grace, or the remission of sins, were granted on account of our works, when could we be assured that we have obtained grace ? when could our conscience find a work sufficient to appease the wrath of God ? We have already said enough on this subject ; each one may examine the passages of Scripture by which we have established this doctrine. The loud complaints I am now making were occasioned by the abominable, shameless, monstrous, premeditated wickedness of our adversaries, when they in plain terms repudiate the doctrine of this article, that we obtain the remission of sin, not through works, but without merit, through faith in Christ.

Our adversaries also adduce some passages of Scripture to justify their condemnation of this article ; for example, they quote the language of Peter : " Give diligence to make your calling and election sure," *through good works, &c.* Here all can see that our adversaries did not spend their money in vain, when they studied dialectics ; for they quote the Scriptures as it suits them, whether to the purpose or not. Thus they reason : " Peter says, ' give diligence to make your calling and election sure,' through good works ; therefore we merit the remission of sins through works." This is a fine argument indeed ! it is like saying of a reprieved culprit in the criminal court : The judge has commanded him henceforth to refrain from such evil deed ; therefore, by abstaining therefrom, he has merited the prolongation of his life. To argue thus, is to make *ex non causa causam* (a cause out of no cause). Peter is speaking of the good works and fruits following faith, and showing why they should be performed, namely, that we may make our calling sure ; that is, that we may not fall from the Gospel by sinning again. He would say : do good works, that you may continue in the Gospel, in your heavenly calling ; that you may not fall away, become cold, and lose the Spirit and the gifts, imparted unto you by grace, through Christ, and not on account of the works which follow them ; for we abide in our calling through faith ; but faith and the Holy Spirit do not remain in those who lead a sinful life.

But they also cite other passages and testimony, no more applicable than the above. Besides, they have the boldness to affirm that this opinion was condemned a thousand years ago, in the days of Augustine. This is false, for the Christian church has always maintained that the remission of sin is granted to us without merit; and the Pelagians were condemned, because they asserted that we receive grace for the sake of our works.

We have sufficiently shown above that we teach that, where there is faith, good fruits and good works must follow; for "we do not make void the law, but establish it," as Paul says, Rom. 3, 31. When we have received the Holy Spirit through faith, good fruits follow; and then we increase in love, in patience, in purity, and other fruits of the Spirit.

IX. OF THE INVOCATION OF SAINTS.

Our adversaries condemn the twenty-first article entirely, because it does not teach the invocation of saints. On this subject they are unusually prolix; but all they can do is, to show that the saints should be honored, and that the *living* saints pray for one another; from this they infer, that it is our duty to invoke the *departed* saints.

They allege that Cyprian entreated Cornelius while he was yet living, to pray for the brethren after his death. Thus they would prove the necessity of invoking the departed saints. They also quote Jerome against Vigilantius, and say that he vanquished him in this matter a thousand years ago.

Thus they glory, as if they had won a decided victory, but the dolts are too ignorant to know that in the writings of Jerome against Vigilantius, there is not a syllable concerning the invocation of saints. Jerome says nothing about their *invocation*, but simply speaks of *honoring* them. Nor did the ancient writers, prior to Gregory's day, mention the invocation of saints. There is no foundation whatever in the Scriptures for the doctrine of our opponents, in regard to this subject, or to the application of the merit of saints.

We do not deny in our Confession that the saints should be honored. This may be done in three ways: *first*, by thanking God for showing us examples of his grace in the lives of the saints, and for supplying the church with teachers and other gifts. Now as these gifts are great, we should highly esteem them, and praise the saints who made good use of them, as Christ in the Gospel praised the faithful servants, Matt. 25, 21, 23.

The *second* mode of honoring the saints, is, to *strengthen our faith by their example*. Thus, for instance, when we see that through the rich grace of God Peter's sin was forgiven, when he had denied Christ, our hearts receive strength to believe that grace abounds much more than sin, Rom. 5, 20.

In the *third* place we honor the saints, by following, according to our several vocations, the example of their faith, love, and patience.

Our adversaries say nothing at all of this true mode of honoring the saints, but merely wrangle about invoking them, which, even if it were not calculated to be dangerous to the soul, would still be unnecessary.

We grant, moreover, that the angels pray for us; for, according to Zechariah 1, 12, the angel prayed, "O Lord of hosts, how long wilt thou not have mercy on Jerusalem?" And although we concede, that as the living saints pray for the whole church in general, so the saints in heaven may pray for the whole church; yet there is no evidence to this effect in the Scriptures, except the dream in the second book of Maccabees, (15, 14.)

Again, though the saints pray for the church, still it does not follow, that they should be invoked. Our Confession, however, simply declares, that the Scriptures do not teach the invocation of saints, or that we should seek aid at their hands. Now if no command, promise, or example can be produced from the Scriptures to establish this doctrine, it follows that no one can rely on it. For, since every prayer must proceed from faith, how can we know that the invocation of saints is pleasing to God, when it is not enjoined upon us in the Word of God? How can we be assured that the saints hear our prayers and the prayers of each one in particular?

Some indeed, do not hesitate to deify the saints, and assert that they know our thoughts and see into our hearts. These things they devise, not for the purpose of honoring the saints, but in order to maintain their profitable chaffering and trading. We still insist that there is no evidence in God's Word that the saints understand our invocation; and even if they do understand it, that God looks upon it with favor; consequently it has no foundation. Our adversaries are unable to gainsay this; they should therefore not attempt to force us into doubtful things; for a prayer without faith is no prayer. True, they say, it is a custom of the church; but certainly it is a *new* custom; for the ancient *Collects*, while they mention the saints, do not invoke them.

Our adversaries, moreover, not only advocate the invocation of saints, but also assert that God accepts their merit in the place of our

sins; and thus they are made to be, not only intercessors, but mediators and reconcilers. This cannot, by any means, be tolerated; for in this way they confer upon the saints, the honor which is due to Christ alone, by setting them up as mediators and reconcilers.

Now although they attempt to make a distinction between the mediators who intercede for us, and the *one* who has redeemed us, and propitiated God; yet they make the saints to be mediators, through whom men are reconciled to God. They assert also, but without scriptural authority, that the saints are mediators to intercede for us; and though we speak of this matter even in the mildest terms, we must still say, that by this doctrine Christ and his blessings are suppressed, and that the confidence they owe to *him*, is transferred to the saints; for they fancy that Christ is a severe judge, and that the saints are kind and gracious mediators; they therefore flee unto the saints, and avoid Christ as they would a tyrant: thus they rely more upon the goodness of the saints than upon the goodness of Christ; they flee from Jesus and seek help of the saints. Thus in fact the saints are still made *mediators of redemption* (*mediatores redemptionis*).

We shall accordingly show, that they make not only intercessors, but propitiators, and *mediatores redemptionis* of the saints. We are *not now speaking of the gross abuses*, through which the populace openly practise idolatry with the saints and pilgrimages; but we refer to the avowed principles of their learned men on this subject. As to the gross abuses, even the uninformed can decide for themselves.

Two things are requisite to constitute a mediator and propitiator: *first*, an indubitable, clear, divine declaration and promise, that through him, God will hear all those who call on him. Such a divine promise is given in the Scriptures, concerning Christ: "Whatsoever ye shall ask the Father in my name, he will give it you," John 16, 23. As to the saints no such promise is made any where in the Scriptures; consequently, no one can have an assurance that he will be heard when invoking the saints, hence such invocation is not of faith. Moreover, the Word of God commands us to call upon Christ, who says: "Come unto me all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. 11, 28. "Even the rich among the people shall entreat thy favor," Psalm 45, 12; and Psalm 72, 11: "All kings shall fall down before him; all nations shall serve him," verse 15: "And daily shall he be praised." John 5, 23, Christ says: "That all men should honor the Son, even as they honor the Father." Again, 2 Thess. 2, 16, 17, Paul prays and says: "Now, our Lord Jesus Christ himself, and God, even

our Father, comfort your hearts, and establish you in every good word and work." All these passages refer to Christ. But our adversaries are unable to adduce any divine command, or an example from the Scriptures, to establish the invocation of saints.

Secondly, a propitiator must have merit to compensate for the sins of others, merits that they can partake of, as if they had themselves made payment. When a friend pays a debt for another, the debt is discharged by such payment, which is regarded as his own. Thus the merits of Christ are imparted and accounted to us, when we believe in him, precisely as if they were ours, and his righteousness and merits are imputed unto us, and become our own.

Upon both these things, namely, the divine promises and the merits of Christ, the Christian prayer must be founded. Such faith in these promises and merits belongs to prayer. We must hold the firm assurance, that we are heard and receive God's mercy for Christ's sake.

But our adversaries teach that we should invoke the saints, although we have no command, promise, or example in the Scriptures to this effect; and in this way they cause greater confidence to be placed in the saints than in Christ, who says, Matt. 11, 28: "Come unto me," not unto the saints.

In the second place, they assert that God accepts the merits of the saints as a recompense for our sins, and thus they teach men to rely on them, instead of the merits of Christ. They also plainly teach the same doctrine in regard to indulgences, by means of which they distribute the merits of the saints, as *satisfactiones* (expiations) for our sins.

Besides, Gabriel, who explained the canon of the mass, declared without hesitation: "According to the order which God has instituted, we should flee to the saints, in order to be saved through their aid and merits." These are the plain words of Gabriel. And, in various places in the writings of our adversaries, we find many things, even more unseemly respecting the merits of the saints. Now, is not this making the saints our propitiators? In this way they become quite equal to Christ, if we are to trust in their merits to be saved.

But where did God institute this order, of which Gabriel speaks, namely, that we should flee to the saints? Let him adduce but one word or one example for it from the Scriptures. Perhaps they derive this order from the custom prevalent in the courts of temporal princes, where the counsellors of the prince bring forward and advocate the affairs of the people, as their mediators. But what if the prince or the king has appointed only one mediator, and will not

graciously hear cases through any other, or will hear no prayers except through him alone? Now, since Christ alone is appointed our high priest and mediator, why do we seek others? What can our adversaries say against this?

A common form of absolution has been in use up to this day, which reads thus: "The passion of our Lord Jesus Christ, the merits of the Virgin Mary and of all saints, shall bring unto you the remission of sins." Here absolution is openly pronounced, not only through Christ's, but also through saints' merits, that through which we are to obtain grace and the remission of sins.

Several of us have seen a doctor of divinity in the agony of death, to whom a monk was sent for the purpose of consoling him. Now, all that this monk had for the dying man, was the prayer: "Mary, thou mother of goodness and grace, guard us against the enemy, and in the hour of death receive us, *Maria Mater gratiæ*," etc.

Even if Mary, the mother of God, prays for the church, it is going too far to say that she can overcome death, or guard us against the great power of Satan. What would we need Christ for, if Mary were able to do all this? For, although she is worthy of the highest praise, yet she does not wish to be held equal with Christ, but desires rather that we should follow the example she gave us, in faith and humility. Now, it is evident that by this false doctrine, Mary was made a substitute for Christ,—she was invoked, in her goodness they trusted, through her they endeavored to propitiate Christ; as if he were not a propitiator, but only a terrible, vindictive judge.

We maintain, however, that men should not be taught to rely on the saints, or to believe that their merits save us; for we obtain the remission of sin and salvation, solely for the sake of Christ's merits, when we believe in him. In reference to the saints it is said, (1 Cor. 3, 8,) "Every man shall receive his own reward according to his own labor," that is to say, they cannot impart their merits to one another, as the monks have had the impudence to sell the merits of their orders. And Hilary says of the unwise virgins: "Inasmuch as the foolish virgins could not go out to meet the bridegroom, because their lamps had failed, they entreated the wise to lend them oil. But these answered, that they could not lend them any, lest both might fail, as there was not enough for all." By this he shows that none of us can help others by supererogatory works or merits.

Now, as our adversaries teach that we should rely on the invocation of saints, although not enjoined of God, nor established by any divine declaration, or any example either in the Old or New

Testament; and since they place the merits of the saints upon an equality with those of Christ, and confer upon them the honor which belongs to him, we can neither approve nor embrace their views and practice, in reference to the supplication or the invocation of saints. For we know that we should place our trust in Christ; then, according to the promise of God, he will be our Mediator; and then we are assured that the merits of Christ alone are a propitiation for our sins. For his sake we are reconciled when we believe in him, as the text says, Rom. 9, 33, 10, 11: "Whosoever believeth on him shall not be ashamed." We should not believe, therefore, that we are justified before God on account of the merits of Mary.

Their divines likewise have the effrontery to teach, that every saint has a particular gift at his disposal; for instance, St. Anna guards against poverty, St. Sebastian against pestilence, St. Valentine against epilepsy; horsemen invoke the knight St. George to guard against wounds and every kind of danger. All this, in reality, had a heathen origin.

Even supposing that our adversaries did not shamelessly teach heathen falsehoods respecting the invocation of saints, still the example itself is dangerous. Now, as they have no divine authority, nor definite testimony from the writings of the ancient Fathers for it, why should they presume to defend things so unfounded?

But this is especially dangerous, because when men seek other mediators besides Christ, they place their confidence in these, and thus, alas! Christ and the knowledge of Christ, are wholly suppressed, as our experience shows. At first some may have mentioned the saints in their prayers, with a pure intention; soon after that the *invocation* of the saints followed; and then, in quick succession other strange, heathenish abominations and abuses insinuated themselves one by one, such as the opinion that images have a peculiar, secret power, as the conjurers and magicians hold, who pretend that certain sidereal signs, engraved on gold, or on other metal at a particular time, have a peculiar, mysterious power and effect.

Some of us once observed in a monastery an image of the Virgin Mary, carved in wood, which, when certain inside cords were drawn, appeared to the spectator to move itself, to nod to the worshippers whom it heard, and to turn away its face from those who brought but small offerings, and whose prayers were not heard.

Though this abomination and idolatry, these pilgrimages and delusions with images, had not been so enormous, yet the fables and false legends they publicly preached about the saints, were even more abominable and detestable. For instance, they preached about

St. Barbara, that at her death she prayed God to reward her torments, by granting that whoever invoked her, could not be able to die without the Eucharist.

A wise man once had St. Christopher, whose name signifies a *bearer of Christ*, painted in gigantic size for children, in order to show that it requires more than human power to bear Christ, and to preach and confess the Gospel. For they must wade through the great sea by night, &c.; that is, they must endure all kinds of great trials and dangers. Afterwards the foolish, illiterate, ungodly monks took it in hand, and taught the people to invoke Christopher, as though he had really been such a great giant, and had carried Christ through the sea.

Now, although the Almighty has performed many great things through his saints, as a peculiar people, both in the church and in temporal affairs, and though many excellent examples are found in their lives, which would be of great utility to princes and lords, to true preachers and pastors, both in state and church government, especially to strengthen their faith in God; yet they have passed by these, and lauded the most insignificant things about the saints, preaching of their hard couches, their garments of hair, &c., the most of which are false.

It would indeed be highly useful and consolatory to hear, how certain great and holy men, (as the Scriptures relate of the kings of Israel and Judah,) ruled their states and people, how they taught and preached, how they endured divers dangers and trials, how many learned men gave advice and comfort to princes and lords in extraordinary and dangerous times, how they preached the Gospel and contended against the heretics. So also would the instances of God's great and special mercy to the saints, be useful and consoling, as, for example, when we see that Peter, who denied Christ, obtained grace; that Cyprian's magic was forgiven him. Again, we read that Augustine, when he was mortally sick, first experienced the power of faith, and publicly confessed God in these words: "Now only have I perceived that God hears the groans and prayers of the believer." Such examples of faith on the part of the saints should have been clearly and faithfully preached and described, to instruct men to fear God and trust in him, and to show them how pious men fared in the church, and in the important affairs of civil government.

But certain idle monks and knaves, not knowing how great and difficult a task it is to govern the church or people of any kind, fabricated fables from the books of heathens, containing nothing but

examples, to show that the saints wore garments of hair, that they prayed at the (seven) prescribed hours, and that they ate bread and water. All this they turned into trade, to obtain money from pilgrimages. The miracles with which they extol the rosary, and similar things of which the Franciscans boast, have the same design. But there is little need of introducing examples; their lying legends are still at hand, so that they cannot deny the charge.

These abominations against Christ, this blasphemy, these base, shameless falsehoods and fables, these false preachers, are and have been tolerated by the bishops and theologians, to the great injury of souls. It is frightful to think of; for these falsehoods afforded them an income. But at the same time they desire to destroy us, while we preach the Gospel in its purity, and although we assail the invocation of saints only, in order that Christ alone may be our Mediator, and that great abuses may be abolished. Long too, before Dr. Luther wrote, even their own theologians, as well as all pious and good men, charged against the bishops and preachers, that they tolerated these abuses from selfish and interested motives; and yet our adversaries have not a word to say about these abuses in their Confutation; consequently, if we should receive the Confutation, we would at the same time sanction all their open abuses.

Their Confutation is full of such artifices and dangerous fraud. They pretend to be as pure as gold, and perfectly innocent. But they nowhere distinguish these manifest abuses from their doctrines; yet many of them are honest and upright enough to acknowledge, that there are many errors in the writings of the Scholastics and Canonists, and that many abuses have insinuated themselves into the church, through illiterate preachers and in consequence of the gross, scandalous negligence of the bishops.

Dr. Luther was not alone, nor the first in lifting up his voice against these numberless abuses. Many learned and upright men before him deplored the great abuse of the mass and of monasticism, the mercenary and venal character of pilgrimages; and especially the utter suppression of the important doctrine of repentance and of Christ, without which no Christian church can stand, and which, above all others, should be taught in its purity and genuineness.

Our adversaries, therefore, have not acted faithfully and like Christians, in silently passing by these palpable abuses in their Confutation. If they had sincerely desired to benefit the church and relieve the oppressed conscience, and not rather to maintain their pomp and avarice, they would have had a proper opportunity and inducement for so doing; and they should, especially on this

occasion, have humbly solicited your Imperial Majesty, our most gracious lord, to remove these gross, palpable, and shameful abuses, which bring disgrace upon us Christians, even among the Turks, Jews, and all unbelievers.

We have clearly observed in various matters, that your Majesty, our gracious lord, undoubtedly seeks after truth with the greatest diligence, and that you desire to see the church properly regulated and established. But while our adversaries care little about doing anything to meet your Imperial Majesty's Christian disposition, wishes, and laudable scruples, or to meliorate this state of things, they seek only to put down both us and the truth. They lose but little sleep on account of the preaching of the Gospel doctrine in its purity. They suffer the ministry to lie waste altogether; they defend open abuses, continue daily to shed innocent blood in unheard-of cruelty and fury, for the sole purpose of sustaining their palpable falsehoods.

Neither will they tolerate pious Christian preachers. Intelligent men can easily judge what this will lead to. For they cannot long rule the church by mere violence and tyranny. If our adversaries seek only to sustain the power of the Pope, this is not the way to do it, but to devastate the empire and the church; for, though they should slay all pious Christian preachers, and put down the Gospel, factionists and fanatics would then rise up in a riot and in violence, harass the congregations and churches with false doctrines, and destroy all order in the church, which we would willingly wish to preserve.

Therefore, most gracious Emperor, as we entertain no doubt that it is the intention and sincere desire of your Majesty, to preserve the truth of God, the honor of Christ, and the Gospel, and to see them ever increase abundantly, we most humbly entreat your Imperial Majesty, not to indulge the unjust designs of our adversaries, but graciously to seek other ways of union, so that the conscience of Christians may not be thus burdened, and that divine truth may not be violently suppressed, and innocent men tyrannically put to death for it's sake, as hitherto has been the case.

Your Imperial Majesty is no doubt aware, that it is your especial office, so far as you can, to preserve the doctrines of Christianity for posterity, and to protect and employ pious preachers of the right kind. For the Lord God requires this of all kings and princes, by conferring upon them his own title, and calling them gods, when he says: "Ye are gods," Psalms, 82, 6. But he calls them gods, because they are, as far as possible, to protect, defend, and administer

divine things on earth, that is, the Gospel of Christ and the pure doctrine of God; and because they, in the stead of God, are to shelter and protect true Christian teachers and ministers, against unjust power.

X. OF BOTH ELEMENTS IN THE LORD'S SUPPER.

117. { It is undoubtedly divine and right, and in conformity with the command of Christ and the words of Paul, to use *both* elements in the Lord's Supper; for Christ instituted both elements, not only for a part of the church, but for the whole. Not only the priests, but the whole church use the Sacrament by the authority of Christ, not of men: and this our adversaries must acknowledge.

Now, if Christ instituted the whole Sacrament for the whole church, why do they take away from the church *one* of the elements? Why do they alter the order of Christ; especially, since he calls it his testament? For, if we ought not to break the testament of a man, much less should we break the testament of Christ. Besides, Paul says, 1 Cor. 11, 23: "For I have received of the Lord that which I also delivered unto you." Now, he certainly gave them both elements, as the text clearly shows, 1 Cor. 11, 24: "This do," says, he, "in remembrance of me." He is here speaking of the body. Afterwards he repeats the same words respecting the blood of Christ; and a little further on, he says: "Let a man examine himself, and so let him eat of that bread, and drink of that cup," &c., 1 Cor. 11, 28. Here he mentions them both.

These are the clear words of the apostle Paul, following shortly after an introductory remark, to the effect that those who would use the Sacrament, should do so simultaneously. Certainly, therefore, it was instituted not only for the priests, but for the whole church.

This custom is observed in the Greek church even to this day, and prevailed also in the Latin or Roman church, as Cyprian and Jerome testify. Thus says Jerome, commenting on the prophet Zephaniah: "The priests, who administer the Sacrament, and distribute the blood of Christ unto the people," &c. The Synod of Toledo testifies the same thing; and it would be very easy to collect many declarations and testimonies in reference to this, but, in order to be brief, we shall omit them. Let each Christian reader judge for himself, whether it is right to forbid and alter the order and institution of Christ.

Our adversaries, in their Confutation, do not consider how the consciences of those, from whom one of the elements has been

withheld by Popery, are to be consoled or excused. It would have been very appropriate for learned and pious doctors to exhibit substantial grounds, for the consolation of the conscience in this situation.

Now, they urge that it is right and consistent with Christianity, to forbid one of the elements; and they do not allow both to be used. In the first place, they imagine that in the early church it was the custom to administer only one of the elements to the laity; and yet they are unable to adduce any authentic case to this effect.

They quote several passages from Luke the Evangelist, concerning the breaking of bread, for instance, Luke 24, 35, that the Lord was known of the disciples in breaking of bread, and refer also to additional passages in regard to this subject. Now, although we have no serious objection to see some of them referred to the Sacrament, yet it does not follow, that in the beginning only one element was administered; for it is a common thing to mention but a part while the whole is meant.

They likewise refer to lay-communion, (*laica communio*), as if it meant the use of but one element, which is not true. For, when the canons enjoin lay-communion upon the priests, it is implied that, by way of chastisement, they should not themselves perform consecration, but yet receive both elements from others. Our adversaries well know this; but in this way they make a display to delude the illiterate and inexperienced; for such men, when they hear the words *communio laica*, are at once led to think of a communion like the present, in which the laity received one element only.

But let us further see how impudently our adversaries write against the order and institution of Christ. Among other reasons for not administering both elements to the laity, Gabriel assigns this also: That there *must* be a difference between the priests and the laity. And I truly believe that the principal reason for maintaining this doctrine so strenuously at this day, is, that the priesthood may appear holier than the laity. This is a human device, the design of which can easily be inferred.

In the Confutation they refer to the children of Eli, 1 Sam. 2, 36, where the text says: "That every one that is left in thine house shall come and crouch to him for a piece of silver and a morsel of bread, and shall say, put me, I pray thee, into one of the priest's offices, that I may eat a piece of bread." Here, say they, the one element is meant; and they add, our laity should therefore likewise be satisfied with *one* part (office) of the priest, that is, with one of the elements.

The authors of the Confutation are certainly impudent and grossly stupid men ; they play and trifle with the Scriptures as they please, referring the history of the children of Eli to the Sacrament, for it is the condign punishment of Eli and his children, that is here described. Will they also assert that the one element is therefore given to the laity as a punishment ? Verily, they are silly and mad.

The Sacrament was instituted by Christ, to console the alarmed conscience, to strengthen our faith when we believe that the flesh of Christ was given for the life of the world, and that by this nourishment we are united with Christ, and obtain grace and life.

But our adversaries have come to the conclusion, that those who receive this sacrament in one form, are thereby to be punished ; and they declare that the laity must be satisfied. This is truly the height of arrogance. But, sirs, dare we not ask *why* they *must* be satisfied. Or are we to consider every thing you desire and say, as true ?

Strange indeed ! how insolent and shameless our adversaries are. They boldly set up their declarations as lordly commands, and say without reserve, that the laity *must* be satisfied ; but why must they ? Are these the grounds on which those are to be exculpated before the judgment-seat of God, who have hitherto withheld from the people one of the elements, and have slain innocent men on that account ? Can they comfort themselves with the declaration concerning the children of Eli, that *they shall beg* ? This will be a sorry excuse before the judgment-seat of God.

They further assign as reasons, why both elements should not be administered : the danger of spilling a drop out of the cup, and other dreams of a similar character, for the sake of which the order of Christ cannot, of right, be altered.

But even admitting it to have been left discretionary, to use one or both elements, how could they prove that they have authority to forbid the use of both elements ? But it does not belong to men or the church, to assume such liberty, or to make *res indifferentes*, that is, things indifferent, of Christ's institutions.

We have no desire to pass judgment upon these poor souls that have been deprived, by force, of the use of one of the elements, and were compelled to endure wrong. But those who have forbidden the use of the two elements, and besides publicly preach and teach thus, seize and destroy men on account of it, heap upon themselves the terrible judgment and wrath of God, and we know no way of excusing them. Let them see to it, how they can justify their design before

God. Nor should we at once receive, as the decision of the *church*, what the bishops and priests resolve; especially, since the Scriptures and the prophet Ezekiel (7, 26,) say, that priests and bishops will come, who know no divine command or law.

XI. OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

Although the great and unheard of debauchery in fornication and adultery among priests, monks, &c., in high institutions, in churches, and monasteries, is so well known throughout the world, as to be publicly sung and talked about; yet our adversaries, who framed the Confutation, are so utterly blind and shameless, as to defend the Papal law forbidding marriage, and that too under the specious pretence of spirituality. Moreover, although they should feel heartily ashamed of this most infamous, lewd, unbridled, and dissolute life in their institutions and monasteries, and this alone should prevent them from looking upward fearlessly, and although their evil, restless consciences should fill them with dread, and cause them to shrink in the honorable and august presence of your Majesty; yet they have the audacity of the hangman; they act like Satan himself, and like all desperate and wicked men they persevere in their blind obduracy, forgetful of all honor, and dead to all sense of shame. These immaculate men have the presumption to admonish your Imperial Majesty, the Electors, and Princes, “not to tolerate the marriage of priests, to the disgrace of the Roman empire!” Such is the language they use; as if their shameful life were a great honor to the church.

How could our adversaries have acted with greater impropriety and impudence, or more effectually disgrace and injure themselves before the public? Such impudent propositions as they make to a Roman emperor, cannot be found in the records of history. Were they not known to the world; had not many pious and upright men, even their own canonists, complained long since among themselves of this shameful, dissolute, and dishonorable conduct; if their shameful, infamous, unholy, dissolute, heathenish, and epicurean life, and the very dregs of all licentiousness at Rome, were not so apparent as to admit of no cloaking, coloring, or palliation—their great purity, their uncontaminated chastity, might be considered the reason why they will hear nothing about a wife or matrimony, and stigmatize this holy estate, which the Pope himself calls the Sacrament of Holy Matrimony, as, *Infamiam Imperii*—the disgrace of the empire.

We shall hereafter state their arguments. In the mean time let each Christian reader, all honorable and pious men, carefully and seriously consider, how totally destitute of reverence, honor, and modesty these men must be, who dare to call holy matrimony, which the sacred Scriptures extol in the highest terms, a disgrace and an infamy to the Roman empire; as if the well-known, scandalous, abominable licentiousness of the Romanists and priests were so great an honor to the church and the empire.

Now, these men have the boldness to ask your Imperial Majesty, whom the ancient writings call a chaste ruler—for surely the passage refers to your Imperial Majesty: *Pudicus facie regnabit ubique*;—yea, they impudently ask your Imperial Majesty and the honorable estates (representatives) of the empire, to countenance (God forbid it) such abominable licentiousness. They ask you to employ your Imperial power—which the Almighty has thus far graciously permitted your Imperial Majesty to enjoy victoriously and happily—in the protection and defence of infamous sensuality and unheard of vice, which even heathens abominate. And in their blood-thirsty, deluded hearts, they desire, in spite of all divine and natural laws, of the councils and their own canons, violently to sever the matrimonial bonds of priests; cruelly to put to death many poor, innocent men, for no other offence but their matrimonial ties; to slay the priests themselves, as great evil-doers, on account of their marriage, while even heathens spared them in much more serious cases; to drive many pious, innocent wives and children into miserable exile, to make them poor forsaken widows and orphans, and to satiate their diabolical hatred with innocent blood: this is what they boldly urge upon your Imperial Majesty.

But inasmuch as Almighty God has blessed your Highness with a great degree of native goodness and chastity, and disposed your Majesty's exalted, noble, Christian mind against countenancing this great licentiousness, or exercising such unheard of tyranny; and as we have no doubt that you will consider this matter in a nobler and more Christian spirit, than do these wicked men, we hope that your Majesty will make a noble and gracious disposition of this matter, and consider that we have good grounds for our position in the holy Scriptures, against which our adversaries adduce nothing but falsehoods and error.

Nor are they really sincere in defending this state of celibacy or single life. For they know full well how chaste they are, and how few among them are continent. But they console themselves with the phrase in their writings: *Si non caste, tamen caute* (though

not chaste, yet cautious); and they know, that to call themselves chaste and to boast of it, while they are not so, seems like chastity before the world, and makes their Papacy and priestcraft appear the holier before men. For the apostle Peter has earnestly warned us, that false prophets will deceive the people with feigned words, 2 Peter 2, 3.

Our adversaries take no serious interest in the cause of religion, which is the principal thing. Whatever they write, speak or treat of, they always appeal *ad hominem* (to the passions of men); they show no earnestness, no fidelity, they have no heart for the common good, to afford relief to the poor consciences, or to oppressed churches; in fact, they are aiming at power, and are zealously proping it up altogether with ungodly hypocritical falsehoods; consequently, it must dissolve like butter exposed to the sun. We cannot, therefore, accept the law of celibacy; for it is contrary to the laws of God and nature, to all the sacred writings, and to the councils and canons themselves. It is, moreover, nothing but hypocrisy; dangerous to the conscience, and altogether pernicious; innumerable offences, detestable, frightful sins and infamy, result from it, and, as we see in the priest-cities and residences (capitals) as they call them, the ruin of all public decency and morals.

The other articles of our Confession, although certainly well founded, still are not so clear but that they may be plausibly assailed. But this article is so evident, that it is hardly necessary to say any thing on either side; whosoever is but honest and fears God, can easily decide for himself; and, although we evidently have the truth on our side, still our adversaries seek in some way or other to assail our position by artifice.

In the first place, it is written in Gen. 1, 28, that man and woman were so created of God, that they should be fruitful, beget children, &c.; and that they should exercise mutual affection. We are not now speaking of the inordinate desire which succeeded the fall of Adam, but of the natural affection between man and woman, which would have been in our nature, even if it had remained pure. And it is the work and order of God, that mutual attachment exist between man and woman. Now, as no one, except God himself, can or should alter the divine order and the inborn nature of God's creatures, matrimony cannot be abolished by any human statute or vow.

Our adversaries assail this strong argument with mere sophistry, asserting, that immediately after the creation, the command: "Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth," was in force; but now, since the earth is replenished, marriage is not enjoined.

Behold, how wonderfully wise our adversaries are! By this divine command, "Be fruitful, and multiply," which still continues and has never ceased to be in force, man and woman were so constituted as to be fruitful, not only in the beginning, but as long as their nature endures. For even as by the command, Gen. 1, 11: "Let the earth bring forth grass, the herb yielding seed," &c., the earth was so constituted as to bring forth fruit, not only in the beginning, but to produce grass, herbs, and other plants every year, while its nature endures; so man and woman were also created to be fruitful, as long as nature continues. Now, as human commands and laws cannot prevent the earth from producing plants, so no monastic vow, or human law can divest human nature of the sexual affections, without a special operation of God.

In the second place, since this divine work and order is a natural right, a natural law, the jurists have properly called the association of man and wife a natural law. Now, as this natural law is immutable, every one has the right to contract marriage. For when God does not alter the nature, the properties must remain which he implanted in it, and which cannot be changed by human laws. Hence it is altogether puerile for our adversaries to say, that in the beginning, when man was created, matrimony was commanded, but that it is not so now. It is like saying that men and women, born at the time of Adam and the Patriarchs, had the nature of men and women, but now it is otherwise; in former times a child was born with its natural propensities, but it is not so now. We are therefore right in adhering to the declaration which the jurists have wisely and rightfully made, *that matrimony is a natural law*. Now, if it be a natural law, it is the order of God thus implanted in nature, and therefore also a divine law. And, inasmuch as no one has a right to change either a divine or a natural law, except God himself, every one must be at liberty to marry. For the native affection existing between man and woman, is the creation and order of God. It is therefore right, and neither angel nor man has power to alter it. The Lord God created not only Adam, but Eve also, not only a man, but also a woman, and blessed them, that they might be fruitful. And, as we have said, we are not speaking of the inordinate desire which is sinful, but of the natural affection which would have existed between man and woman, even if their nature had remained pure. The evil lust, since the fall, has increased this inclination, so that we have much greater need now of matrimony, not only to propagate the human race, but also to prevent sin. This clear argument is irrefutable: the devil and all the world cannot shake it.

In the third place, Paul says: "To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife, and let every woman have her own husband," 1 Cor. 7, 2. This is a general command, and it pertains to all who are not naturally fitted for celibacy. Our adversaries require us to show a divine command enjoining marriage upon priests; as if they were not men. Whatever the Scripture says concerning the whole human race generally, is certainly applicable to the priests also. Paul here commands those who have not the gift of continence to marry; for, soon afterwards he explains himself, saying: "It is better to marry than to burn;" 1 Cor. 7, 9. And Matt 19, 11, Christ clearly says: "All *men* cannot receive this saying, save *they* to whom it is given."

As then, since the fall of Adam, both the natural affection and the inborn evil lust exist in all of us, and this lust foment the natural desires, so that matrimony is even more necessary than before the corruption of human nature, Paul thus speaks of matrimony, in order to assist our weakness; and to prevent burning passion, he commands those to marry, to whom marriage is necessary. And the declaration: "It is better to marry than to burn," cannot be abolished by any human law or monastic vow; for no law can change the inborn constitution of our nature. All, therefore, who are subject to sexual passion, have the right to marry; and all those who are unable to continue truly pure and chaste, are bound to follow the command of Paul: *To avoid fornication let each one have his own wife*. In this matter each one must examine his own conscience.

Now as our adversaries assert that we should pray to God for chastity, and mortify our bodies by fasting and labor, *they* should of right practise such mortification. But, as we have already said, our opponents are not in earnest in this matter—they trifle and prevaricate at pleasure. If it were possible for every one to be continent, there would be no need of a special divine gift, but Christ, the Lord, says, that this is a special gift of God, and that *all men cannot receive this saying*. God therefore wishes all others to enter into the state of matrimony which he has instituted; for he does not desire his creation and ordinance to be treated with contempt; but would have men to be chaste, namely, to enter into the state of matrimony which he instituted to preserve conjugal purity and chastity, in like manner as he wishes us to use the meat and drink which he created for our subsistence. Gerson tells us, that many pious and eminent men attempted to establish themselves in chastity by mortifying the body, and yet failed. St. Ambrose is therefore right in saying, "that continence may be recommended,

but not commanded." If any man should say, that Christ the Lord commends those that made themselves eunuchs for the sake of the kingdom of heaven, he should consider that Christ speaks of those who have the gift of continence; for this reason he adds: "He that is able to receive it, let him receive it," Matt. 19, 12. The false chastity in the monasteries and cloisters is not pleasing to the Lord. We admit, that true chastity is a noble, divine gift; but we are speaking of the injustice of laws *prohibiting* marriage, and of those who have not received this gift. Marriage must therefore be left free, and the consciences of men unfettered.

In the fourth place, this Papal law is contrary also to the canons and to the ancient councils.* For the ancient canons do not forbid marriage, nor do they dissolve the state of matrimony; although they remove those from their ecclesiastical offices, who contract marriage. At that time, under certain circumstances, this was rather a favor than a punishment. But the new canons, which were not made in the councils, but by the Popes, forbid marriage, and dissolve it when contracted. It is evident, then, that this is contrary to the Scripture, and to the commandment of Christ, who says: "What therefore God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," Matt. 19, 6.

Our adversaries vociferously maintain that celibacy or chastity is enjoined upon the priests by the councils. We do not oppose the councils in this matter, (for they do not forbid marriage,) but the new law which the Popes made contrary to the councils. The Pontiffs themselves, therefore, reject the decision of the councils, while they undertake to command others to submit to these decisions, at the hazard of incurring the divine wrath and eternal condemnation. Hence the law, forbidding the marriage of priests, is really a Popish law of Roman tyranny. For thus the prophet Daniel describes the kingdom of Antichrist: "Neither shall he regard the God of his fathers, nor the desire of women," Dan. 11, 37.

In the fifth place, while they do not maintain this ungodly law for the sake of holiness, or from ignorance, (for they certainly know that they do not observe chastity,) they give occasion for the grossest hypocrisy, by making a false display of holiness. They say that chastity is required of the priests because they must be holy and pure, as if matrimony were impurity, or as if we could more readily become holy and just, in the sight of God, in celibacy than in matrimony. To prove this they refer to the priests under the law of Moses; for, say they, while the priests ministered in the Temple, they were required to withdraw from their wives; there-

fore, as the priests, under the New Testament dispensation, are to pray without ceasing, they should observe perpetual continence. This inappropriate, foolish comparison is introduced by them as a clear and positive argument, fully establishing the obligation of the priests to perpetual chastity. But, even if this simile were applicable or appropriate, it would simply show, that the priests should withdraw from their wives only when they are to engage in church services. Besides, it is one thing to pray, and another to perform the functions of a priest in the church; for many saints have prayed without having ministered in the Temple, nor were they prevented from so doing by living with their wives. But we shall now reply to these fictions in regular order. *First*, our adversaries cannot deny, but must acknowledge, that among believing Christians matrimony is a pure and holy state, being sanctified by the Word of God. For it was instituted of God, and it is established by his Word, as the Scripture abundantly testifies. Christ says: "What God hath joined together, let no man put asunder," Matt. 19, 6. Here we are told, that God unites man and wife in matrimony; hence it is a pure and holy, noble and commendable work of God.

And concerning marriage, meats, and the like, Paul says, 1 Tim. 4, 5: "For it is sanctified by the Word of God and prayer"—*First*, by the divine Word, through which the heart is assured that matrimony is pleasing to the Lord God: *secondly*, by prayer, that is, by returning thanks, which is done in faith, when we enter into the state of matrimony, and receive our meat and drink with thankfulness.

1 Cor. 7, 14, we find: "The unbelieving husband is sanctified by the wife"—that is, matrimony is pure and good, a Christian and holy state, on account of faith in Christ, and we may enjoy it with thanksgiving, as we do meats and drinks.

Again, 1 Tim. 2, 15: "Notwithstanding, she shall be saved in child-bearing, if they continue in faith," &c. How our adversaries would triumph, if they were able to adduce passages like these, in favor of their priestly chastity. Paul says that the wife shall be saved in child-bearing. How could the holy apostle have spoken more emphatically against the shameful hypocrisy of their abominable and false continence, than by saying, that they shall be saved in their conjugal works, in child-bearing, in their domestic offices, &c. But what does Paul mean? He expressly adds: *If they continue in faith, &c.*; for the duties and labors of matrimony in themselves, without faith, are not commended by him. Thus he desires above all, that they should have God's Word, and faith, through which

(as he invariably says) they receive the remission of their sins, and are reconciled to God. Then he mentions the duties of woman's office and vocation, as good works should follow faith in the case of every Christian, and as all are bound to be useful to others in their calling. Now, as these good works are pleasing to God, so also do the works, which a believing woman performs in her vocation, please God; and the woman that attends to the duties of her calling in the matrimonial estate, shall be saved.

These passages show that matrimony is a holy and Christian state. Now if that may be called *purity*, which is holy and acceptable in the sight of God, then marriage is such, because it is established by the Word of God. Paul says, Tit. 1, 15: "Unto the pure all things are pure"—that is, unto those who believe in Christ. Wherefore, as the chastity of the ungodly is impure, so matrimony, on the part of believers, is holy on account of the divine Word and faith.

But if our adversaries mean by purity, the absence of concupiscence, the heart is pure when its evil desires are mortified. For the law of God does not forbid marriage, but concupiscence, adultery, and fornication; therefore outward celibacy is not true purity; yea, there may be greater purity in the heart of a husband, as in the case of Abraham and Jacob, than in many who really preserve their bodily chastity.

Finally, if they call continence purity, on the ground that it justifies us before God, rather than matrimony, they are in error. For we obtain the remission of sin without merit, for the sake of Christ alone, when we believe that we receive the grace of God, through the blood and death of Christ. But our adversaries will exclaim, that we, like Jovian, place marriage upon an equality with celibacy. We shall not, however, for the sake of their declamation, deny divine truth and the doctrine of Christ, and of righteousness by faith, as exhibited above. Nevertheless, we are not disposed to withhold the praise and commendation due to celibacy, nay, we admit that it is a superior gift. For, even as wisdom in a ruler is a gift superior to others; so continence is a higher gift than the state of matrimony. And yet, as no sovereign is more just before God on account of his ability and prudence, than is any other man on account of his skill, so continence has no more justifying power before God, although a superior gift, than the state of matrimony as such. Let each one faithfully employ his talent, and remember that the remission of sins is obtained for Christ's sake, through faith, and that this is the ground on which we are accounted just before God.

Christ the Lord and Paul commend celibacy, not because it has any justifying power before God, but because those who remain unmarried, being unembarrassed by domestic cares, the management of a family, &c., have a better opportunity to read, to pray, write, and make themselves useful. Hence Paul says to the Corinthians, that celibacy is commended, because this state affords a better opportunity to read God's Word and to instruct others. Nor does Christ unqualifiedly commend those who made themselves eunuchs, but adds: *for the sake of the kingdom of heaven*; that is, that they may more easily learn and teach the Gospel. He does not say, that celibacy merits the forgiveness of sins.

As to the case of the Levitical priests, we have already replied that this does not prove that celibacy is required of the priests. Nor does the law of Moses, with its ceremonies respecting purity or impurity, at all concern us as Christians. According to that law, if a man "touched" his wife, he was impure for a time, but now the Christian husband does not become unclean on that account; for the New Testament says: "Unto the pure all things are pure." By the Gospel we are liberated, not only from the laws pertaining to impurity, but from all the ceremonies of Moses. Now, if any one should undertake to defend celibacy, for the purpose of imposing upon the conscience these Levitical observances, we must oppose him even as zealously as the Apostles opposed the Jews, Acts 15, 7-10, because they wished to bind the Christians to the law of Moses and to circumcision.

But pious Christians, in the state of matrimony, will know how to observe moderation in the conjugal relation. For those who are engaged in the affairs of government, or occupy ecclesiastical offices, and have to labor, must indeed be chaste even in wedlock. The burdens of important affairs, in which countries and nations, governments and churches are interested, are a good remedy against the lusts of the old Adamic nature. The pious are aware also, that Paul says, 1 Thess. 4, 4, 5: "That every one of you should know how to possess his vessel in sanctification and honor; not in the lust of concupiscence." But what can the chastity of so many thousands of monks and priests be, who, without any concern, live in all manner of indulgence, in idleness and extravagance, without the Word of God, which they neither learn nor regard? Every species of licentiousness must follow such a life. Such men can practise neither Levitical nor constant chastity.

Many heretics, who understood neither the law of Moses nor its application, spoke contemptuously of marriage; yet on account of

this hypocritical display they were regarded as holy. Epiphanius violently complained that the Encratites gained a high reputation among the ignorant, by their hypocritical display, especially of chastity. They drank no wine, not even in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; they abstained altogether from fish and meat; they were even holier than the monks, who eat fish; they also abstained from marriage. This at first made a great show, and they believed that these works and this fictitious holiness reconciled God, as our adversaries teach.

Paul, in writing to the Colossians, vehemently opposes this hypocrisy and pretended angelic holiness. For, when men fall into such error, as to hope to be made pure and holy in the sight of God through such hypocrisy, the doctrine of Christ is altogether suppressed; and these hypocrites do not understand the gift of God, or his command; for he would have us use his gifts with thanksgiving.

We might easily refer to examples showing that many pious and conscientious souls have been grieved and endangered, because they were not properly informed that matrimony, with its obligations and relations, is of a holy and Christian character. This great evil resulted from the inappropriate preaching of the monks, who commended celibacy and continence beyond measure, and decried the matrimonial estate as an impure life, full of sin, and a great impediment to salvation.

But our adversaries do not contend so strenuously for celibacy because they have any real confidence in this show of holiness; for they know that at Rome, as well as in all their institutions, the grossest lasciviousness prevails, without disguise or concealment. Nor do they seriously desire to live chaste, but knowingly practise this hypocrisy before the people; they are therefore worse, and more detestable than the heretical Encratites, among whom there was at least more earnestness; but these Epicureans are not sincere; on the contrary, they scorn God and men, and make these pretences for the sole purpose of enabling them to continue their unbridled indulgence.

In the sixth place, though we have so many reasons for rejecting the Papal law of celibacy, it is, besides, productive of incalculable danger to the conscience, and of numberless offences. Now, even if this Papal law were not unjust, still this oppression of conscience, destroying an untold number of souls, should certainly deter all honest men from embracing it.

Many honorable men, and among them even their own bishops, canonists, &c., have made complaint of the severe burden of celibacy; and they discovered that they themselves as well as others, fell into great

danger of conscience on account of it. But no one paid any attention to this grievance. Moreover, it is manifest that it corrupts the public morals, wherever there are priestly institutions, and produces the most abominable immorality, sin, infamy, and monstrous vices. Rome can see herself faithfully portrayed in the satyres and other writings of the poets.

Thus, almighty God avenges the rejection of his gift and of his commandment on those who forbid marriage. Now, as useful laws have frequently been altered when the general good required it, why should not this law be altered, when so many cogent reasons and oppressive bonds upon the conscience call for its alteration?

We see that these are the latter days. As the aged are weaker than the young, so the whole world and all nature are in their last days and decline. Sin and vice are not decreasing, but waxing greater every day. We should, therefore, so much the more freely employ the remedy which God has given, namely, the state of matrimony, to put down this licentiousness. We learn from the book of Genesis, that the vice of fornication prevailed before the deluge; and in Sodom, Sibaris, Rome, and other cities, abominable debauchery prevailed, before they were destroyed. These examples portray what will come to pass in the latter days, immediately before the end of the world. Inasmuch, then, as experience also shows that licentiousness prevails more extensively now than it ever did before, faithful bishops and governments should much rather make laws to encourage than to forbid marriage, and commend it by word, work, and example. Such is the duty of the government, which is bound to use all diligence in preserving decency and order.

Now, God has given the world over to such blindness, that adultery and fornication are tolerated almost with impunity, but on the other hand, punishment is imposed upon matrimony. This is truly astonishing. The preacher should admonish those who have the gift of continence, not to despise, but to use it to the honor of God, and exhort others, to whom marriage is needful, to embrace that state.

In many instances, the Pope daily dispenses with useful laws, highly important to the general good, and which he should never suspend. But in the law of celibacy, he is inflexible, notwithstanding that it is known to be a mere human law. They have cruelly slain many good men, who never injured any one, merely because they married for conscience' sake. It is, therefore, to be feared that like the blood of Abel, this sin will so loudly cry to heaven, that they will never be able to get over it, but will have to tremble as Cain did. And

this Cain-like shedding of innocent blood, shows that this doctrine of celibacy is diabolical; for Christ the Lord calls the devil a murderer, who would with the greatest delight maintain this tyrannical law with nothing but blood-shed and murder.

We are well aware that some loudly denounce us as schismatics. But having sought peace and union, with all due diligence, our consciences are altogether at rest, since our adversaries will not be satisfied, unless (God forbid) we deny the clear, divine truth, and consent with them to receive this detestable Papal law, to tear from each other, pious, innocent husbands and wives, to murder the married priests, to drive off innocent wives and children into misery, and to shed innocent blood without any cause. But inasmuch as it is certain that such acts are not pleasing to God, we should rejoice that we have no union or communion, nor any part with our adversaries, in the shedding of so much innocent blood.

We have pointed out the reasons, why we cannot conscientiously agree with our adversaries to defend celibacy; for it is contrary to all divine and natural laws, and contrary to the canons themselves. Besides, it is altogether dangerous and hypocritical; because they do not so strenuously maintain this feigned continence on account of holiness, or from ignorance on the subject. They know full well that every one is acquainted with the state of things in their high institutions, which we could name; but they defend celibacy only for the purpose of maintaining their tyranny and dominion. No honest man can gainsay the clear and strong arguments adduced above. The Gospel leaves the state of matrimony free to all those who feel its necessity; but yet it does not compel those to marry, who have the gift of continence, if it only be true, and not hypocritical. This right, we maintain, must be conceded to the priests also; and we will not force any one into celibacy, nor separate pious consort, or dissolve the ties of matrimony.

We have now briefly presented some of our grounds for the present, and also stated what shallow artifices and dreams they attempt to refute them with. We shall now show how forcibly they defend their Papal law. *First*, they say, that God revealed this law. Here may be seen the utter shamelessness of these ungodly men. They are bold enough to assert that their prohibition of marriage is revealed of God, whereas it is palpably opposed to the Scriptures, and to Paul, when he says: "To avoid fornication, let each one have his own wife," 1 Cor. 7, 2. Again, if the Scriptures and the canons expressly forbid any dissolution of existing marriages, how dare these knaves object to it, and abuse the high and holy name of

the divine Majesty, so boldly and impudently? Paul the apostle plainly states what god first introduced that law, namely, Satan himself; for he calls it the *doctrine of devils*, 1 Tim. 4, 1-3. And, indeed, the fruits show us the character of the tree, when we see what terrible, abominable vices have sprung from it,—as in Rome for instance,—and see that the devil is constantly producing murder and blood-shed from this law.

The *second* argument of our adversaries is, that the priests must be pure, as the Scripture says: "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord," Isaiah 52, 11. We have already refuted this argument; for we have clearly shown that chastity without faith, is not purity before God, and that matrimony is holiness and purity on account of faith, as Paul says: "Unto the pure all things are pure," Tit. 1, 15. Thus we have abundantly shown that the ceremonies of Moses respecting cleanness and uncleanness, cannot properly be applied to this subject; for the Gospel requires purity of heart. And there is no doubt that the hearts of Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and the Patriarchs, who had many wives, were purer than the hearts of many virgins who were really pure, so far as bodily chastity is concerned. But when Isaiah says: "Be ye clean that bear the vessels of the Lord," this is to be understood as applying to Christian holiness in general, and not merely to celibacy. But even this passage commands the impure unmarried priests to marry and become pure; for, as we said heretofore, marriage is purity unto Christians.

Their *third* argument is the most monstrous of all, namely, that the marriage of priests is heresy. Have mercy on our poor souls, dear sirs, and spare us! This is quite a new thing, that the holy state of matrimony, which God created in Paradise, has become heresy; then, indeed, the whole world would be full of heretics. It is a barefaced falsehood that the marriage of priests is Jovian heresy, or that it was condemned as such by the church. For, at the time of Jovian, the church knew nothing of this Papal law, by which marriage is wholly forbidden to the priests; and our adversaries are well aware of this; but they frequently quote ancient heresies, with which they compare our doctrine, contrary to their own convictions, for the sole purpose of making the impression upon the illiterate, that our doctrine was formerly condemned by the church, and thus exciting every body against us. Such are the artifices they practise, and this is the reason why they were unwilling to favor us with a copy of the Confutation. They were fearful that their palpable falsehoods might be answered, and that they would then incur eternal infamy among all posterity. But touching the doctrine of Jovian,

we have already stated our views on the subjects of chastity and matrimony. And, while we do not say that matrimony is equal to virgin purity, we hold that neither celibacy nor marriage justifies men before God.

With these vain, loose arguments they endeavor to defend the Papal law of celibacy, which has occasioned so much vice and immorality. The princes and bishops, who believe these teachers, will plainly perceive whether these arguments will hold good, when the hour of death shall come, and they must render an account unto God for having dissolved the marriage of pious consorts; for abusing and torturing them; for putting so many priests to death, and shedding innocent blood, regardless of all the lamentations, the cries, and tears of so many widows and orphans. These are things they dare not think of doing. The tears of poor widows, and the blood of the innocent, are not forgotten in heaven; they will, in due time, cry out before high heaven against such tyrants, unto God the righteous judge, as forcibly as did the holy, innocent blood of Abel. Now, when God shall judge this cruelty, our adversaries will see that their arguments are mere straw and stubble, and that God is a consuming fire before which nothing can stand that is contrary to the divine Word, 1 Pet. 1, 26.

But, at all events, our princes and rulers would have the consolation of knowing that they acted with a clear conscience. For, though the marriage of priests were objectionable, which we do not admit, still it is directly contrary to the Word and will of God, that our adversaries thus dissolve existing marriage contracts, throw poor innocent persons into misery, and slay them. True, our rulers take no pleasure in innovations and schisms, yet in so just and clear a case, they are bound to let the Word and truth of God overrule every thing else. May God grant this, through his grace. Amen!

XII. OF THE MASS.

In the first place, we must mention, by way of introduction, that we do not abolish the mass; for mass is held in our churches on every Sunday and festival, when the Sacrament is administered to those who desire it, that is, after they have been examined and absolved. Besides, the real Christian ceremonies are likewise observed, in reading, singing, praying, &c.

Our opponents enter into a lengthy, bungling, and puerile discussion about the use of the Latin language in mass, and about the great

benefit derived, even by the illiterate, who do not understand the Latin language, from hearing mass, in the faith of the church. They imagine that attending mass, is, of itself, an efficacious divine service, even when not a word is heard or understood. We shall not treat these assertions with the severity they deserve, but are content to leave them to the judgment of intelligent men. We refer to them, simply to show that the Latin mass, lessons, and prayers, are also retained among us.

But inasmuch as these ceremonies are designed to afford the people an opportunity to learn the Scripture and God's Word, that they may fear God, obtain consolation, and learn to pray aright,—for this is the object of ceremonies—we retain the Latin language for the sake of those who understand the Latin, and combine with it the use of German hymns, for the benefit of the people and their instruction in the fear and knowledge of God. This custom was always approved in the church, and in all our churches the people sung more or less German hymns; consequently, this custom cannot be so new. But where is the Pharisaic doctrine to be found, that hearing mass without understanding it, is meritorious and salutary, *ex opere operato*? Shame upon ye sophists, with your dreams.

But our practice of holding no private, but public mass alone, when the congregation receive the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is not contrary to the principles of the universal Christian church; for even to this day, no private mass is held in the Greek churches; they have but one kind of mass, and that is held on Sundays and great festivals. All this shows what was the ancient practice of the church. The teachers who lived prior to the time of St. Gregory, never mention private mass in any of their writings. We shall not, for the present, show how private mass originated. This is certain, that when the mendicant orders and the monks had begun to prevail, their false doctrines led to the introduction of more and more masses every day, for mercenary purposes, and this was carried to such an extent that the theologians themselves continually complained of it. And although St. Francis, from good motives, attempted to remedy this evil, and ordered his followers to be content with one general mass for each cloister daily; yet this useful statute was afterwards altered through hypocrisy, or for the sake of pecuniary interest. Thus they themselves alter the regulations of the ancient Fathers as they please, whenever it is to their advantage; and yet they afterwards tell us, that the ordinances of the ancient Fathers must be held sacred. Epiphanius says that in Asia communion was held three times every week, and that there was

no daily mass; and he tells us that this practice came from the Apostles.

Now, although our adversaries have thrown together many remarks and quotations on this point, to prove that the mass is a sacrifice; yet we can soon stop all this clamor, and silence them by simply replying, that this array of authorities, arguments, &c., does not prove that the mass, *ex opere operato*, merits the forgiveness of sins and the remission of guilt and punishment for the priests or for others for whom it is performed. This one plain answer subverts all the arguments of our adversaries, not only in the Confutation, but in all the works they have published on the mass.

This is the main question in the whole matter; and we call upon every Christian reader, carefully to observe whether our adversaries adhere also to it; for they are in the habit of making many useless and unexpected digressions from the main question. For, if the main point be closely and firmly adhered to, without introducing any thing foreign, both sides can be more easily understood.

We have shown in our Confession, that we hold that the Eucharist or the mass does not confer grace, *ex opere operato*, and that mass, performed for others, does not merit for them the remission of sins, of punishment, and guilt. And for this position, we have the strong and indubitable grounds, that it is impossible for us to obtain the forgiveness of sin through our works, *ex opere operato*,—that is, through the performed work in itself, *sine bono motu utentis*, without regard to the disposition of the mind, or though there be no good emotion in the heart; but the terrors of sin and death must be overcome through faith in Christ, when our hearts are cheered and comforted by the knowledge of Christ, as stated above; when we are conscious that God is gracious unto us for Christ's sake, his merits and righteousness being imparted to us, Rom. 5, 1: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God," &c. This foundation is so strong and firm, that all the gates of hell can make no impression on it,—of this we are sure.

Now this would be sufficient on the whole subject; for no rational or intelligent man can approve this Pharisaic or Pagan hypocrisy and the great abuse of the *opus operatum*. And yet this error has come to prevail throughout the world; hence the universal introduction of the mass in all charitable institutions, cloisters, churches, hermitages, and in every corner. Mass is celebrated for lucre, and to appease the wrath of God, to obtain the remission of sins, redemption from guilt and punishment, to liberate the dead from purgatory, to secure health, riches, success, and prosperity in the occupations

of life. These hypocritical, Pharisaic views were planted in the church by the monks and sophists. Now, although the error involved in the abuse of the mass, is sufficiently refuted by the fact that men do not obtain the remission of sins through their works, but through faith in Christ; yet, as our adversaries grossly distort many passages of Scripture into a defense of their errors, we shall submit a few additional remarks.

Our adversaries have much to say in their Confutation about sacrifice, although in our Confession we have intentionally avoided the word *sacrificium*, on account of its ambiguity, while we clearly pointed out the gross abuses which they design and practise under this name. Now, in order to refute their distorted quotations, we must first explain the word *sacrificium* or sacrifice.

For ten whole years our adversaries have been engaged in writing a host of books to show that the mass is a sacrifice, and not one of them have ever yet defined what a sacrifice is. They simply look for the word *sacrificium* in Concordances of the Bible, and apply it to this question, whether applicable or not. They pursue the same course with the works of the ancient Fathers, and then add their own dreams, as if sacrifice must signify whatever they wish.

The nature of the sacrifice, and its various kinds.

In order that we may not enter blindly upon our subject, it is necessary for us, in the first place, to show what is, and what is not sacrifice; it is necessary and useful for every Christian to know this. The theologians are accustomed to make a proper distinction between sacrifice and sacrament. Now, as to their *genus* [in the general character, common to both,] we will admit, that they are ceremonies or holy acts.

A sacrament is a ceremony or an external sign or work, through which God grants what the divine promise, annexed to the ceremony, offers. For instance, baptism is a ceremony and work, not given or offered by us to God, but in which God makes a gift and an offer to us, in which he, or the minister in his stead, baptizes us. Here God offers and gives us the remission of sins according to his promise: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved," Mark 16, 16.

On the other hand, a sacrifice is a ceremony or a work which we offer unto God, that we may honor him.

There are chiefly two kinds of sacrifices, and no more, in which all others are comprehended. The *one* is a propitiatory sacrifice, by

1 which expiation is made for guilt and punishment, God is reconciled,
 2 his wrath appeased, and remission of sins obtained for others. The
 other is a sacrifice of thanksgiving, not to obtain forgiveness of sin
 or reconciliation, but made by those who are already reconciled, in
 order to give thanks for the remission of sins, and for other favors
 and gifts they received.

We must be careful in this and many other controversies, not to
 lose sight of this distinction, which is strongly supported in the
 Epistle to the Hebrews, and in many other places in the Scripture.
 All the sacrifices under the law of Moses, however diverse they
 may be, can be reduced to these two *genera* or kinds. In the law
 of Moses some are called expiatory sacrifices, or offerings for sin; not
 that the forgiveness of sins was merited by them in the sight of God,
 but because they were designed as an external reconciliation, those
 for whom they were made being reconciled by such sacrifice so as
 not to be excluded from the people of Israel. They were, therefore,
 called *expiatory sacrifices*, while the others were sacrifices of
 thanksgiving.

True, in the law there were indications of the true sacrifice, but
 there has been only one real expiatory sacrifice, or sacrifice for sin,
 in the world, namely, the death of Christ; as the Epistle to the
 Hebrews says: "For it is not possible that the blood of bulls and
 of goats should take away the sins," Heb. 10, 4; and then verse 10
 says concerning the obedience and will of Christ: "By the which
 will we are sanctified, through the offering of the body of Jesus
 Christ once for all."

Isaiah the prophet also previously explained the law of Moses,
 and shows that the death of Christ is the ransom for sin, and not
 the offerings of the law, when he says of Christ: "When thou shalt
 make his soul an offering for sin, he shall see his seed, he shall pro-
 long his days," Isaiah 53, 10. The Prophet referred the term,
 "offering for sin," to the death of Christ, in order to show that
 the expiatory sacrifices in the law were not the right sacrifice to
 make satisfaction for sin, but that another sacrifice would come,
 namely, the death of Christ, by which the wrath of God should be
 appeased.

Again, the sin-offerings under the law had to cease, when the
 Gospel was revealed, and the right sacrifice had been made. There-
 fore, they were not true reconciliation in the sight of God; for they
 were discontinued, and another took their place. Hence, they were
 only symbols and types of the true reconciliation. Accordingly,
 the truth is firmly established, that there has been but one sacrifice.

namely, the death of Christ, which was intended to be an atonement for others, and to appease the wrath of God.

Besides this one expiatory sacrifice, namely, the death of Christ, there are others, all of which are merely sacrifices of thanksgiving, such as bearing the cross—preaching—the good works of saints, &c.; these are not sacrifices by which we are reconciled, which we can make for others, or which merit, *ex opere operato*, forgiveness of sin or reconciliation; for they are made by those who are already reconciled through Christ. Such are our sacrifices in the New Testament; as Peter the apostle says, 1 Pet. 2, 5: “Ye are built up a spiritual house, a holy priesthood, to offer up spiritual sacrifices, acceptable to God by Jesus Christ.”

In the New Testament no sacrifice is of any avail, *ex opere operato, sine bono mutu utentis*, that is, the work without good thoughts (motives) in the heart; for Christ says, John 4, 23: “The true worshippers shall worship the Father in spirit and in truth;” that is, with the heart, with cordial fear and sincere faith. Consequently, the doctrine of our adversaries, that their mass merits the forgiveness of guilt and punishment, *ex opere operato*, is nothing but an antichristian, Pharisaic, and diabolical doctrine and service.

Nor did the Jews properly understand their ceremonies, thinking themselves just before God, when they had performed the works, *ex opere operato*. The Prophets, however, most earnestly opposed this error, that they might turn the attention of the people from their own works to the promises of God, and lead them to faith and to the true services of God. Thus it is written, Jeremiah 7, 22, 23: “I spake not unto your fathers, nor commanded them in the day that I brought them out of the land of Egypt, concerning burnt-offerings or sacrifices; but this thing commanded I them, saying, obey my voice, and I will be your God,” &c. What may the obstinate Jews have said to preaching like this, which so evidently appeared to be contrary to the law and to Moses? For it was obvious that God had required the fathers to sacrifice, and Jeremiah could not deny it. But Jeremiah condemned their false views on this subject, which God had not enjoined, namely, that sacrifices, *ex opere operato*, had the power to reconcile and please God. Jeremiah, therefore, adds this declaration in reference to faith, that God commanded: *Hear me*, that is, believe me, that I am your God, that I preserve you, that I have compassion on you, help you always, and need not your sacrifices; believe that I am your God, who makes you just and holy, not on account of your merits, but for the sake of my promises; therefore, expect all your consolation and help from me.

This pagan view of the *opus operatum* is also condemned in the fiftieth Psalm, verses 13 and 15, where it is said: "Will I eat the flesh of bulls, or drink the blood of goats? Call upon me in the day of trouble," &c. Here the *opus operatum* is condemned, and we are admonished to call upon God; and it is declared to be the noblest service of God, to call upon him with our hearts.

Again, we find in the fortieth Psalm, verse 6: "Sacrifice and offering thou didst not desire: mine ears hast thou opened." That is, thou hast given me a word which I am to hear, and requirest me to believe it and thy promises, that thou wilt help me; and Psalm 51, 16, 17: "Thou desirest not sacrifice, else would I give it," &c. "The sacrifices of God are a broken spirit," &c. So in the fourth Psalm, verse 5: "Offer the sacrifices of righteousness; and put your trust in the Lord." Here we are commanded to place our trust in the Lord,—and this is called a true sacrifice; here it is shown that the other sacrifices are not true. Again, Psalm 116, 17: "I will offer to thee the sacrifices of thanksgiving, and will call upon the name of the Lord," &c.

And the whole Scripture abounds with similar passages, showing that no sacrifice and no work, *ex opere operato*, reconciles God. Hence it teaches that in the New Testament, the sacrifices of the law of Moses are abolished, and that none but pure, unstained sacrifices are now left, namely, faith in God, thanksgiving, the invocation of God, preaching the Gospel, crosses and afflictions of saints, and the like.

Malachi speaks of these sacrifices, saying: "For from the rising of the sun, even unto the going down of the same, my name shall be great among the Gentiles; and in every place incense shall be offered unto my name, and a pure offering," ch. 1, 11.

Our adversaries falsely and foolishly say, that this passage refers to the mass, and point to the authority of the ancient Fathers. But it is easy to reply to them; for even if Malachi were speaking of the mass, which he is not, still it would not follow that the mass justifies us before God, *ex opere operato*, or that we can hold mass for others, to obtain the remission of sin for them. The Prophet says nothing of the kind, but it is an impudent device of the sophists and the monks themselves.

But the words of the Prophet, themselves set forth the proper meaning. First he says: The name of the Lord shall be great; this is accomplished through the preaching of the Gospel. Through it the name of Christ is made known, and the grace promised in him. Now, through the preaching of the Gospel, men are led to faith; and

it is then they call upon God aright, and thank him, suffer persecution for God's sake, and do good works. Therefore, the Prophet calls it the pure offering; not indeed, the ceremonies of the mass solely *ex opere operato*, but all spiritual offerings, through which the name of God is magnified, namely, the preaching of the Gospel, faith, invocation, prayer, confession of the Gospel and of Christ before the world, &c., are pure, holy sacrifices.

We would not seriously object even to referring this text to the ceremonies of the mass, provided it be not held that the mere ceremonies, *ex opere operato*, reconcile God. For, as we call preaching a praise-offering, so the ceremony of the Eucharist in itself may be a praise-offering, but not an offering that justifies, *ex opere operato*, before God, or which, when performed for others, effects the remission of their sins. But we shall soon show in what sense ceremonies are an offering. Now, as Malachi is speaking of all the services and offerings of the New Testament, he evidently does not allude to the mass or the Eucharist alone. Again, as he plainly opposes the Pharisaic error of the *opus operatum*, this passage is not against, but rather for us; for he requires the thank-offerings of the heart, through which the name of the Lord is to be magnified.

They also quote Malachi 3, 3: "And he shall purify the sons of Levi, and purge them as gold and silver, that they may offer unto the Lord an offering in righteousness." He is here speaking of an offering in righteousness; hence the text opposes the *opus operatum*. The offering of the sons of Levi, that is, of those who preach under the New Testament dispensation, is the ministry of the Gospel and the good fruits of the ministry; as Paul, Rom. 15, 16, says: "That I should be the minister of Jesus Christ to the Gentiles, ministering the Gospel of God, that the offering-up of the Gentiles might be acceptable, being sanctified by the Holy Ghost." For the slaying of oxen and sheep under the law, signified the death of Christ and the ministry of the Gospel, by which the old Adamic nature is to be daily mortified, and the new and eternal life begun.

But our adversaries apply the word *sacrifice* exclusively to the ceremony of the mass. They have not a word to say about the ministry of the Gospel, faith, thanksgiving and calling upon the divine name, although the ceremony was instituted for this purpose, and the New Testament requires altogether the spiritual offerings of the heart, and not the sacrifices of the Levitical priesthood.

Our adversaries also refer to the *juge sacrificium*, that is, the daily sacrifice, saying that as there was a daily sacrifice under the law of Moses, so the mass is the daily sacrifice under the New

Testament dispensation. If this matter could be settled by allegories, every one could find allegories to answer his purpose. But all intelligent men know, that in matters of such great importance in the sight of God, we must have positive and plain declarations of God, and no distorted, obscure, and irrelevant passages. Such doubtful interpretations will not stand the test before the judgment-seat of God.

Although, to gratify our adversaries, we might consent to have the mass called the *juge sacrificium*, or daily sacrifices, provided they apply this term to the whole mass, that is, the ceremonies including thanksgiving, faith in the heart, and sincere invocation of divine grace. All these together might be called the *juge sacrificium* of the New Testament; for on their account the ceremony of the mass or Eucharist was established; for it was instituted for the sake of preaching, as Paul says: "For as often as ye eat this bread, and drink this cup, ye do show the Lord's death till he come," 1 Cor. 11, 26. But the figure of the daily offering by no means proves, that the mass is a sacrifice which reconciles God, *ex opere operato*, or by which we can obtain for others the remission of their sins. Now, if we take a proper view of the *juge sacrificium*, or the daily sacrifice, we shall discover that it portrays not only the ceremonies, but also the preaching of the Gospel. For in Numbers 28, 4, 5, 7, three parts are laid down, as belonging to this daily offering:—The burning of a lamb, libation of wine, and oblation of flour.

The whole law of Moses is a shadow and figure of Christ and the New Testament; hence Christ is thus portrayed there. The lamb signifies the death of Christ; the libation of wine signifies, that all believers in the world are sprinkled with the blood of the lamb through the Gospel, that is, that they are sanctified, as we are told, 1 Pet. 1, 2: "Through sanctification of the Spirit, unto obedience and sprinkling of the blood of Jesus Christ;" the oblation of flour signifies the invocation and thanksgiving in the hearts of all believers. Now, as we find the shadow and prefiguration of Christ or the Gospel in the Old Testament; so we must look in the New Testament, not for a new type or figure which might be called a sacrifice; but for the Gospel and the truth, which the figure signifies.

And, although the mass, or the ceremony of the Eucharist, is a memorial of the death of Christ, yet the ceremony alone is not the continual or daily offering; but the remembrance of Christ's death, in connection with the ceremony, is the daily offering, that is, the preaching of faith and Christ—the faith that truly believes that God

is reconciled through the death of Christ. To this continual sacrifice also belong the fruits of preaching, namely, that we be sprinkled with the blood of Christ, or sanctified; that the old Adam be mortified and that we grow in the Spirit,—this is the sprinkling; then we should also return thanks and praise to God, and confess the faith with patience and good works,—this is signified by the flour and oil.

Thus, when we remove the gross Pharisaic error of the *opus operatum*, we discover that the spiritual and the daily offering of the heart are meant by the *juge sacrificium*; for, Heb. 10, Paul says that there is a shadow of good things to come in the law, but the body and the truth (reality) are in Christ. Now, it is the knowledge of Christ, and the Holy Ghost in the heart, that produce thanksgiving and daily spiritual offerings in the heart. From this it is evident that the figure of the *juge sacrificio*, daily sacrifice, is not against, but rather for us; for we have clearly shown that everything belonging to the daily sacrifice in the law of Moses, must signify a true heart-felt offering, not an *opus operatum*. Our adversaries falsely imagine that the external work and ceremonies alone are signified; whereas heart-felt faith, preaching, confession, thanksgiving, and sincere prayer, are the true daily offerings and the most noble part of the mass, whether called sacrifice or otherwise.

Now, all pious Christians can easily perceive that the charge of our adversaries, accusing us of abolishing the continual sacrifice, is unjust. But experience shows that they are the real *Antiochi* ruling in the church as furious, blood thirsty, and despotic tyrants; who, under the garb of spirituality, arrogate all the power in the world, and are perfectly indifferent about the ministry, Christ, or the Gospel. Moreover, they have the presumption to establish new church services at pleasure, and to defend them by violence alone. Our adversaries retain only the ceremonies of the mass, but its proper use they neglect; they use it only for avaricious purposes and shameful traffic, and then imagine that it is profitable to others, and merits for them the remission of sin, of punishment, and guilt. In their sermons they do not teach the Gospel, they impart no consolation to the conscience, nor do they preach the remission of sins without merit, for Christ's sake; but talk of the invocation of saints, satisfaction, expiation, and human traditions, declaring that they justify man before God. And although there are so many of these palpable, blasphemous abuses, yet, because they are profitable, they seek to maintain them by violence. Even the most learned preachers

among them discuss intricate philosophical questions, which neither they nor the people understand. Finally, although some of them may be tolerable scholars, yet they teach nothing but the law, without saying any thing about Christ or faith.

Our opponents quote the language of Daniel, who says, ch. 9, 27, that there shall be abomination and desolation in the churches; and they apply this to our churches, because the altars are not covered, and there are no burning candles there, &c. But it is not true that we abolish all such external ornaments; and even if it were; Daniel is not speaking of things altogether external, and not belonging to the Christian church. He has reference to a far different and more abominable desolation, which is prevailing in Popery, namely, to the rejection of the most necessary and important service, the ministry, and to the suppression of the Gospel. Our adversaries mostly preach of human ordinances, which lead the soul away from Christ and encourage it to rely on human works; hence it is evident that no one in the Papal church understood the doctrine of repentance, as our adversaries taught it; and yet it is one of the most important subjects in the whole range of Christian truth.

Our antagonists have tortured the poor conscience with the enumeration of sins; but as to faith in Christ, through which we obtain the remission of sins, and of the real struggles and trials, exercising our faith, they offered no correct instruction to the conscience for its consolation. All their books and preaching were not only less satisfactory on this subject, but really worked unspeakable injury. Moreover, they have among them the monstrous, abominable abuse of the mass, the like of which has scarcely ever existed on earth, besides a mass of other unchristian, foolish services. This is the very desolation of which Daniel speaks.

On the contrary, in our churches, the priests duly attend to their office; they teach the Gospel and preach Christ, proclaiming the remission of sins and the grace of God, not on account of our works, but for the sake of Christ. This doctrine affords true, firm, and constant comfort to the heart. They also inculcate the Ten Commandments, and the genuine good works which God has enjoined, as well as the proper Christian use of the holy Sacraments.

Now, if the Eucharist or mass could properly be called the daily sacrifice, it might more justly be termed so *among us*. Among them the priests mostly hold mass from mercenary motives; but in our churches the holy Sacrament is not abused in this manner. It is never celebrated for the sake of money, but the people are to examine themselves for the purpose of seeking consolation there.

Besides, they are instructed in the proper Christian use of the Sacrament, namely, that it was instituted to be a seal and sure testimony of the remission of sins, to admonish their hearts and strengthen their faith, firmly to believe that their sins are forgiven. Now, as the preaching of the Gospel and the proper use of the Sacraments are preserved among us, we have without doubt the daily offering.

As for outward decency, our churches are better adorned than those of the opposite party. For the real external ornaments of the church are true preaching, the proper use of the sacraments, and the regular, zealous, and devout attendance for instruction and prayer. By the grace of God, Christian and wholesome instruction is given in our churches for consolation in all trials, hence the people gladly attend such preaching. Nothing does more to attach the people to the church than good preaching. But our adversaries preach the people out of their churches, because they do not teach the most important parts of Christian doctrine, but relate legends of saints and other fables.

Besides, when our adversaries set up their candles, altar coverings, images, and like ornaments as necessary things, and establish them as a divine service, they are the servants of Antichrist, of whom Daniel says that they honor their God with silver, gold, and like ornaments, Dan. 11, 38.

They also quote Hebrews 5, 1: "Every high priest taken from among men, is ordained for men in things pertaining to God, that he may offer both gifts and sacrifices for sins." From this they conclude, that as there are bishops and priests under the New Testament dispensation, there must also be a sacrifice for sin. Now, this might make some impression on the unlearned and inexperienced; especially when they consider the magnificent pomp in the temples and churches, and of the garments of Aaron. As there were many ornaments of gold, silver, and purple under the Old Testament dispensation, they think that under the New there must be a similar service, similar ceremonies and sacrifices, offered for the sins of others, as in the Old Testament. All the abuses of the mass and the Papal worship originated in the desire to imitate the ceremonies of Moses, in their ignorance of the fact that the New Testament is occupied with other matters, and that these external ceremonies, though applicable to the discipline of children, should not transcend their proper limits.

Although our position is very fully established in the Epistle to the Hebrews, yet our adversaries quote several passages from this very epistle, in a mutilated form, as they did, for instance, in the

place above, where it is said that every high priest is ordained to offer, &c. The text immediately refers this to Christ. The preceding words speak of the Levitic priesthood as a prototype of the priesthood of Christ. The Levitical offerings for sin did not merit the forgiveness of sins in the sight of God, but were only a figure of Christ, who was the real, true, and only offering for sin, as we have already said. Nearly the whole Epistle to the Hebrews treats mainly of the fact that the Levitical priesthood and the sacrifices in the law, were not instituted for the purpose of meriting the remission of sins, or effecting the reconciliation of God, but only to foreshadow Christ, the true, future sacrifice. The Patriarchs and the saints under the Old Testament also, were justified and reconciled to God through faith in the promise concerning the future Christ, through whom salvation and grace were promised, in like manner as we, under the New dispensation, obtain grace through faith in Christ, who is now revealed. All believers, from the beginning of the world, believed that a sacrifice and ransom would be offered for sin, namely, Christ, who was to come, and was promised, as Isaiah says, 53, 10: "When thou shalt make his soul an offering for sin," &c.

Now, as no one under the Old Testament obtained remission of sin through the sacrifices, they having only signified the one sacrifice of Christ, it follows that there is only one offering, namely, Christ, who made payment and satisfaction for the sins of the whole world. In the New Testament, consequently, there is no sacrifice to be made as a recompense for sin, except only the death of Christ, who was offered once upon the cross.

When they therefore assert that under the New Testament there must be a priest to offer sacrifice, this can be conceded with reference to Christ alone. The whole Epistle to the Hebrews strongly urges and confirms this view. It would really be setting up other mediators besides Christ, were we to admit any other satisfaction for sin, or any reconciliation but the death of Christ.

As the priesthood of the New Testament is an office, through which the Holy Spirit operates, there can be no sacrifice that benefits others, *ex opere operato*. When no special faith and life are produced by the Holy Spirit, no *opus operatum* can justify or save us. Hence it is obvious, that the mass cannot be celebrated for the benefit of others.

We have now shown why the mass justifies no man in the sight of God, *ex opere operato*, and why mass cannot be celebrated in behalf of others; for both are directly opposed to faith and to the

doctrine of Christ. For it is impossible that sin should be forgiven, or that the terrors of death and hell should be overcome through the work of another, or otherwise than through faith in Christ alone, as we read, Rom. 5, 1: "Therefore, being justified by faith, we have peace with God," &c.

We have also demonstrated, that the passages of Scripture, quoted against us, do not prove anything in favor of the heathenish, anti-christian *opus operatum* doctrine of our adversaries. All honest and godly men whatsoever can see this. We therefore reject the error of Thomas, who says that the body of the Lord was once offered upon the cross for original sin, and is daily offered upon the altar for our daily sins, so that the church has a daily sacrifice to reconcile God. The other errors are likewise to be rejected, namely, that the mass, *ex opere operato*, benefits him that holds it; and that when mass is held for others, though they be ungodly, they obtain the remission of sins and are redeemed from guilt and punishment, provided only that they offer no obstruction. These are all errors, devised by ignorant and wicked monks, who are utter strangers to the Gospel, to Christ, and faith.

This error in regard to these abuses of the mass, gave rise to numberless others, for instance to the question whether mass, when held for many, is as efficacious as when celebrated for each person individually. This controversy increased the numbers and price of mass.

Further, they also hold mass for the dead, to release their souls from purgatory—a shameful traffic—although the Sacrament benefits neither the living nor the dead without faith. Our antagonists cannot produce a particle of proof from the Scripture in confirmation of these dreams and fables, which they preach with the greatest assurance, although without the authority of the church or the Fathers. • They are ungodly, perverse men, who knowingly reject and trample upon the plain truth of God.

The ancient teachers or Fathers on the sacrifice.

Having properly explained and answered the Scripture passages, quoted by our adversaries, it becomes necessary for us also to reply to the passages which they cite from the writings of the ancient Fathers. We are well aware, that the Fathers call the mass a sacrifice; but they did not entertain the opinion, that the mass imparts the remission of sins, *ex opere operato*, or that it should be held for the living and the dead, to obtain for them the forgiveness of sins and to release them from guilt and punishment. Our opponents can never

show, that the Fathers taught any such abomination contrary to all the Scriptures; but the books of the Fathers treat of thanksgiving and thank-offerings; for this reason they call the mass *Eucharistia*. We have already shown that thanksgiving does not impart the remission of sins, but is offered by those who are already reconciled by faith in Christ; even as crosses and afflictions do not merit reconciliation to God, but are thank-offerings, when those who are reconciled willingly bear and endure them.

And these few words are a sufficient vindication against their quotations from the Fathers, and amply protect us against our adversaries. It is certain that their dreams, relative to the *opus operatum*, can nowhere be found in the works of the Fathers. But in order that this whole subject of the mass may be more clearly understood, we shall likewise speak of the proper use of the Sacrament, and accordingly show how it is represented in the holy Scripture, and in all the writings of the Fathers.

Of the proper use of the Lord's Supper, and of the sacrifice.

Some pedantic scholars imagine that the sacrament of the Lord's Supper was instituted for two reasons:—*First*, to be the sign and badge of an order, as are the caps of the monks:—*Secondly*, they conceive that Christ took particular pleasure in appointing a feast or supper as such a sign, to show forth the fraternal friendship, which should exist among Christians; for to eat and drink together, is an evidence of friendship. But these are human thoughts, and do not show the proper use of the Sacrament. They speak only of love and friendship, which worldly men can also manifest; but nothing is said about faith or the promise of God, things of the most exalted character, transcending our conception.

But the Sacraments are evidences of the divine will or purpose towards us,—they are not only marks or signs of recognition; and those are correct, who say that the sacraments are *signa gratiæ*, that is, evidences of grace. And as there are two things in the Sacrament, the external sign and the word, the word in the New Testament is the promise of grace attached to the sign. This promise in the New Testament, involves the remission of sins, as the text says: "This is my body, which is given for you. This cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins," Luke 22, 19, 20. These words offer us the remission of sins. The external sign is, as it were, a seal and con-

firmation of the word and promise; as Paul also calls it. Now, as the promise is useless, unless received in faith, so the ceremony or outward sign is useless without the faith which truly believes that we receive the remission of sins. This faith consoles the alarmed conscience. And as God gives the promise in order to awaken such faith, so the external sign is also given with it, and placed before our eyes, to induce the heart to believe, and to strengthen faith; for through these two things, the Word and the external sign, the Holy Spirit operates.

This is the proper use of the holy Sacrament, that the alarmed conscience be consoled through faith in the divine promises. And this is the true service of God in the New Testament, in which the chief worship of God takes place in the heart, in the mortification of the old Adam, (Adamic nature,) and regeneration through the Holy Spirit. For this purpose Christ instituted the Sacrament, saying: "This do in remembrance of me," Luke 22, 19. The doing of this, in remembrance of Christ, does not consist merely in external acts, performed merely as an admonition and example, as in history, we remember the deeds of Alexander and others; but it means to know Christ truly, seeking and desiring his benefits. Now the faith which perceives the abounding grace of God, is life-giving.

This is the principal use of the Sacrament, from which it readily appears who are really prepared to receive it, namely, those who are alarmed, who feel their sins, dread the wrath and judgment of God, and long for consolation. The Psalmist, therefore, says: "He hath made his wonderful works to be remembered: the Lord is gracious and full of compassion. He hath given meat unto them that fear him," Psalm 111, 4, 5. The faith which acknowledges this mercy, gives life to the soul; and this is the proper use of the Sacrament.

To this must then be added the thank-offering or thanksgiving; for when we perceive what great dangers, distress, and terror we are saved from, we are profoundly thankful for this inestimable treasure, employ the ceremonies or the external signs to the honor of God, and show that we receive this gift of God with thankfulness, and highly esteem it. Thus the mass becomes a thank-offering or an offering of praise.

Accordingly we find the Fathers speaking of a two-fold effect or use of the Sacrament: *First*, that it affords consolation to the conscience; *secondly*, that it expresses praise and thanks to God. The *first* properly pertains to the right use of the Sacrament; the *second*, to the sacrifice. With regard to consolation, Ambrose says: "Go to him, that is, to Christ, and receive grace, &c.; for he is the

remission of sins. But you ask: Who is he? Hear him speak himself: 'I am the bread of life; he that cometh to me shall never hunger; and he that believeth on me shall never thirst,' " John 6, 35. Here he shows, that the forgiveness of sins is offered in the Sacrament; and he says that we should embrace this by faith. In the writings of the Fathers, numbers of such passages can be found, all of which our adversaries refer to the *opus operatum* and to the holding of mass for others, whereas the Fathers are speaking of faith in the promises of God, and of the consolation which the conscience receives, but not of its application to others.

Moreover, we find passages in the books of the Fathers, concerning thanksgiving, for instance the beautiful language of Cyprian on Christian communion: "The Christian heart," says he, "divides its thanks, offering one part for the presented treasure, the other for the sins forgiven; and it returns thanks for this abundant grace; that is, the Christian heart remembers what is presented to it in Christ, and what great guilt it was rescued from through grace; it compares our misery and the great mercy of God, and returns thanks to him," &c. Hence it is called *Eucharistia* in the church. The mass, therefore, is not thanksgiving which we can offer for others, *ex opere operato*, to obtain forgiveness of sin for them. This would be directly contrary to the doctrine of faith; it would be equivalent to saying, that the mass or the external ceremony without faith, has justifying and saving power.

Of the word mass.

On this point the gross stupidity of our adversaries is apparent. They say that the word *missa* is derived from the word *misbeach*, which signifies an altar; from this it follows, as they claim, that the mass is an offering; for upon the altar the offerings are made. Again, the word *liturgia*, as the Greeks call the mass, is also said by them to signify an offering. To this we shall briefly reply. It is obvious that from these premises the antichristian and pagan error does not necessarily follow that the mass is beneficial, *ex opere operato, sine bono motu utentis*. It is therefore ridiculous for them to introduce arguments so flimsy, on a subject of such great importance. Nor can they have any knowledge of grammar; for *missa* and *liturgia* do not signify a sacrifice. *Missa*, in the Hebrew, signifies a contribution or collection. For it was the custom at one time among the Christians, to bring food and drink into the

congregation for the benefit of the poor. This custom was derived from the Jews, who had to bring such contributions to their festivals, and who called them *missa*. *Solilurgia* in Greek properly signifies an office in which service is rendered to the public; this corresponds exactly with our doctrine, that the priest, as public servant, renders service to those who wish to commune, and administers to them the holy Sacrament.

Some think, that *missa* is not from the Hebrew, but that it is equivalent to *remissio*, remission of sins; because when communion was over, it was said: *Ite, missa est*, depart, your sins are remitted. In proof of this, they allege that among the Greeks it was said *λαοις αφεσις*, (*Laos aphesis*), which is also equivalent to saying, forgiveness unto the people. If this were so, it would be an excellent idea; for the remission of sin should always be preached and announced in connection with this ceremony. But whatever the word *missa* may signify, it is of little account in this controversy.

Of the mass for the dead.

Our antagonists have no evidence nor divine command in the Scriptures, for maintaining that the mass benefits the dead,—an error which they have turned into a peculiar traffic, and made an article of extensive trade. Now, it is a monstrous abomination and a great sin for them to presume, without divine command or any authority from Scripture, to establish a service in the church, and to apply to the dead the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, which Christ instituted to preach the Word, to commemorate his death, and to strengthen the faith of those who partake of it. This is truly abusing the name of God, and is contrary to the second commandment.

It is the greatest insult and blasphemy of the Gospel and Christ, to assert that the mere work of the mass, *ex opere operato*, is an offering which reconciles God, and makes satisfaction for sin. It is a dreadful doctrine, a monstrous abomination, that the miserable work of a priest is worth as much as the death of Christ. Surely sin and death cannot be overcome, except by faith in Christ, as Paul says Rom. 5, 1; hence the mass cannot in any way benefit the dead, *ex opere operato*.

We shall not now show with what weak arguments our adversaries sustain purgatory, nor how the doctrine of expiation and satisfaction originated, having shown above that it is a mere dream and an invention of human vanity; but this we shall say to them, that

certainly the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is properly designed for the remission of guilt. For what consolation could we have, if forgiveness were offered there, and yet it were not the remission of guilt? Now, as this ceremony offers the remission of guilt, it cannot possibly be a satisfaction, *ex opere operato*, or benefit the dead; and if it is designed for the remission of guilt, it can serve only to console the conscience, and to assure it that its guilt is really forgiven.

Indeed, we need not wonder that all pious Christians should feel the keenest anguish, and weep tears of blood, if they had a proper conception of the monstrous abuse of the mass under Popery, namely, its almost exclusive employment for the dead, and for redemption from the penalties of purgatory.

They charge us with abolishing the *juge sacrificium*, or the daily offering, but they are themselves really putting down the true continual sacrifice in the church; they really equal the tyranny and fury of the ungodly *Antiochus*, in their attempts to suppress the whole Gospel, the whole doctrine of faith and Christ, and in preaching in their stead, the falsehoods of the *opus operatum*, founded upon their dreams respecting satisfaction. It is really trampling the Gospel under foot, and shamefully perverting the use of the Sacraments. These are the very blasphemers, of whom Paul says, 1 Cor. 11, 27, that they are guilty of the body and blood of the Lord, who suppress the doctrine of Christ and faith, and turn the mass and the Eucharist into a scandalous public traffic—all under the hypocritical pretence of satisfaction. For this great sacrilege the bishops must expect severe punishment from God, who will certainly verify the second commandment, and pour out upon them his great wrath. We and all others must therefore be careful, not to make ourselves partakers of the abuses of our antagonists.

But we shall now return to the subject. As the mass is not an expiation, either for punishment or guilt, *ex opere operato*, it follows that its employment for the dead is vain and useless. Nor is there any need of a lengthy controversy; for it is certain that the holding of mass for the dead has no foundation in the Scripture. It is an abomination to institute any service to God in the church, without authority from the Scriptures. If necessary, we shall speak more fully on this subject, as it may require; for, why should we now go into a serious contest with our adversaries, since they do not understand the nature of the sacrifice, the Sacrament, the remission of sins, or faith.

Nor does the Greek canon apply the mass as an expiation for the dead; for it employs it alike for all the Patriarchs, Prophets, and

Apostles, from which it appears that the Greeks also offered it as a thanksgiving, and not as a satisfaction for the punishment of purgatory. Surely, it was not their intention to release the Prophets and Apostles from purgatory; but merely to join them in offering thanks for the noble, eternal blessings conferred on them and us.

Our opponents allege that the opinion of a certain man, called Acrius, who is said to have held that the mass is not an offering for the dead, was condemned as heresy. Here they resort, however, to their usual subterfuge, by pretending that our doctrine was rejected in the ancient church. These dolts do not hesitate at any falsehood; for they neither know who Acrius was, nor what he taught. Epiphanius writes, that Acrius maintained that prayer for the dead is useless. Now, we are not speaking of prayer, but of the Lord's Supper; and the question is, whether this is a sacrifice that benefits the dead, *ex opere operato*. This matter therefore has nothing to do with Acrius.

Whatever else may be adduced in favor of the mass, from the writings of the Fathers, has no bearing upon this controversy. For the good and pious Fathers did not teach the abominable, blasphemous, antichristian error, that the mass, *ex opere operato*, merits the remission of guilt and punishment for the living and the dead; for this error is a manifest heresy, contrary to all the Scriptures of the Prophets and Apostles. All Christians should know, that this Popish mass is nothing but frightful idolatry.

But such idolatry will remain in the world while Antichrist continues to reign. For as there was a false worship established in Israel for the adoration of Baal, and unholy services were performed under the semblance of the true worship of God; so Antichrist, in the church, turned the Lord's Supper into an idolatrous service; and yet, as God preserved his church, that is, a number of saints in Israel and Juda, so he preserved his church, that is, a few saints, under Popery, so that the Christian church did not entirely disappear. Although Antichrist will, to some extent, continue with his false modes of worship, till Christ the Lord shall visibly come and judge the world; yet all Christians should guard themselves against such idolatry, and learn to serve God truly, and to seek the remission of sins through faith in Christ, that they may truly honor God, and have a substantial consolation against sins. For God graciously sent his Gospel light to warn and save us.

We have made these brief statements relative to the mass, in order to show all godly men of every nation, that we with all due diligence preserve the true honor and the proper use of the mass,

and that we have most important reasons for not agreeing with our adversaries. We warn all good men, not to participate with our adversaries in this great abomination and abuse of the mass, and thus to burden themselves with the sins of other men. This is a most weighty matter; this abuse is equal to that in the days of Eli, in the false worship of Baal. We have now presented this matter in mild and gentle terms; but if our adversaries continue their vituperation, they will find that we can speak to them with greater severity.

XIII. OF MONASTIC VOWS.

About thirty years ago a Franciscan monk, named John Hilten, in Eisenach, a town in the district of Thuringia, was cast into prison by his brethren, because he had exposed certain notorious abuses in monastic life. We have seen a part of his writings, from which it is easy to perceive that he preached in a Christian spirit and agreeably to the holy Scripture; and those who were acquainted with him, testify to this day, that he was a pious, quiet, old man, of irreproachable character. This man predicted many things concerning the present times, and prophesied what has already come to pass, and some things that are still to happen; but these we shall not now relate lest it be thought that we do so from envy, or to please any one. Finally, when the infirmities of age, as well as imprisonment, had thrown him into a state of disease, he sent for the Guardian [spiritual adviser among the Franciscans] to attend him, and gave him an account of his illness. But when the guardian, in Pharisaic bitterness and hatred, assailed him with harsh language, on account of his doctrine, which seemed to obstruct their culinary interest, he ceased complaining of his bodily weakness, and, deeply sighing, he said with an earnest countenance, that he would freely suffer this injustice for Christ's sake, although he had neither written nor taught any thing disadvantageous to the condition of the monks, but that he had attacked only gross abuses. Finally, said he: "Another man will come, in the year MDXVI, who will destroy you monks; him you cannot put down or resist." This language concerning the decline of monasticism, and this very date, were afterwards discovered in other books of his, and especially in his commentaries on Daniel. But we shall leave each one to judge for himself what is to be thought of this man's declaration. But there are other indications of the decline of monasticism.

It is evident that the monastic system is nothing but the grossest hypocrisy and deception, full of avarice and pride: and the more ignorant and stupid the monks are, the more obstinate and wrathful, bitter and virulent are they in persecuting the truth and the Word of God. Their sermons and writings are altogether puerile, inconsistent, and foolish; and all their efforts are directed to the gratification of their appetites and avarice.

In the beginning, the cloisters were not such dungeons or everlasting prisons, but schools in which youth and others were trained in the holy Scriptures. But now this pure gold has become dross, and the wine is turned to water. Nearly all the most extensive ecclesiastical institutions and cloisters are filled with indolent, unprofitable, and idle monks, who, under the guise of holiness, live on the public alms in the greatest extravagance and voluptuousness. But Christ says, Matt. 5, 13: "But if the salt have lost his savor, wherewith shall it be salted? it is thenceforth good for nothing, but to be cast out, and to be trodden under foot of men." Now the monks, by leading such a wicked life, are actually digging their own graves.

Another sign of the downfall of the monks, is, that they instigate and participate in the murder of many pious, innocent, and learned persons. The blood of Able is crying out against them, and God will avenge it. We do not say this of all; there may be some in the cloisters, who know the holy Gospel of Christ, and attach no idea of holiness to their traditions, and who have not made themselves guilty of the innocent blood which the hypocrites among them are shedding.

But we are now speaking of the doctrine, which the framers of the Confutation commend and defend. We are not discussing the point, whether we should observe vows to God; for we also maintain that we are bound to observe proper vows. The following are the questions before us:—Can we obtain the remission of sins before God through vows and the monastic ceremonies?

Are they expiations for sin?

Are they equal to baptism?

Do they impart such perfection, as to enable us to keep both the *præcepta* and *consilia*, that is, not only the commandments, but even the counsels?

Are they secure, evangelical perfection?

Whether monks have *merita supererogationis*; that is, so many superfluous merits or holy works, that they do not need them all?

Do these merits save those to whom they are transferred?

Are monastic vows in accordance with the Gospel, when made with this view?

Have these vows a divine and Christian character, when forced upon unwilling hearts, and upon those who are too young to understand what they are doing, and when parents or friends thrust them into cloisters for their temporal support, merely to save their patrimony?

Whether those are Christian vows which really lead to sin, namely, that friars and nuns must approve and embrace the detestable abuse of the mass, the invocation and adoration of saints, and make themselves partakers of the innocent blood that has been shed?

And finally, are those legitimate and Christian vows which cannot be kept on account of the frailty of human nature?

These are the questions at issue. And although we have referred in our Confession to many improper vows, which the canons of the Popes themselves disapprove; yet our adversaries would have all our propositions rejected. For they say in express terms, that all our suggestions ought to be repudiated.

But it seems necessary now to show how they assail our positions, and how they sustain their cause. We shall, therefore, briefly reply to their remarks. And as this subject is thoroughly discussed in Dr. Martin Luther's *Treatise on Monastic Vows*, we shall regard this book as renewed and repeated here.

In the first place, such vows certainly are neither divine nor Christian, when made with a view of obtaining the remission of sins before God, or of expiating them. This is an obvious error, contrary to the Gospel, and blasphemy against Christ. For the Gospel teaches that we obtain the remission of sins without merit, through Christ, as we have already abundantly shown. We have, therefore, very properly referred to the declaration of Paul to the Galatians 5, 4: "Christ is become of no effect unto you, whosoever of you are justified by the law; ye are fallen from grace." Those who seek the remission of sins, not through faith in Christ, but through monastic vows and ceremonies, rob Christ of his honor, and crucify him anew. Now we ask the reader to notice, how the authors of the *Confutation* seek shelter behind the assertion, that Paul here refers to the law of Moses alone; but the monks perform all their works for Christ's sake, and diligently strive to live in the strictest conformity with the Gospel, in order to merit eternal life. To all this they add the fearful declaration: "Whatever is said against monastic life, is unchristian and heretical." Lord Jesus

Christ! how long wilt thou bear with the open reproach offered to thy holy Gospel, when our enemies blaspheme thy Word and truth?

It is asserted in our Confession, that we must obtain the remission of sins without merit through faith in Christ. Is not this the pure Gospel, as the Apostles preached it? If this be not the Gospel voice of the eternal Father, which thou, O Lord, who sittest in the bosom of the Father, hast revealed to the world, we justly deserve to be punished. But thy severe and bitter death on the cross, thy holy Spirit, whom thou hast richly bestowed, and thine entire holy Christian church, afford irresistible evidence, clear as the sun, that the sum and substance of the Gospel is, that we obtain the remission of sins, not on account of our merits, but through faith in Christ.

If Paul asserts that we do not merit the forgiveness of sins even through the holy, divine law of Moses and its works, he certainly means, that we can much less accomplish this through human ordinances, which he amply shows to the Colossians. For if the works of the law of Moses, which was revealed of God, do not merit the remission of sins, how much less can it be effected by such foolish things, as monastic works, rosaries, and the like, which are neither necessary nor useful even in the external life, much less capable of imparting eternal life to the soul.

Our adversaries dream that Christ abolished the law of Moses, and came after him establishing a new and better law, through which the forgiveness of sins must be obtained. By this fanatical, foolish notion, they suppress Christ and his blessings. They also imagine that among those who observe this new law of Christ, the monks more nearly imitate Christ and the Apostles, in their obedience, poverty, and chastity, whereas the whole monastic life is nothing but impudent, shameful hypocrisy. They boast of their poverty, while, in their great abundance, they have never realized how a poor man feels. They boast of their obedience, and no class on earth are under less restraint than the monks, who, with masterly skill, set themselves free from obedience to the bishops and princes. We have no desire to speak of their extraordinary, immaculate chastity; we shall leave this to Gerson, who really concedes but little purity and holiness, even to those who zealously endeavored to live undefiled; while most of them are hypocrites, and scarcely one in a thousand seriously thinks of living pure and chaste, to say nothing of the inward thoughts of the heart.

Is this their boasted holiness? is this living in accordance with Christ and the Gospel? Christ did not thus succeed Moses, for the purpose of introducing a new law, to remit sins in consideration of

our works; but he offers his own merit and his own works, against the wrath of God in our behalf, that we may obtain grace without merit. But he that sets up his own works against the wrath of God, without the reconciliation of Christ, and would obtain the remission of sins on account of his own merits, whether he produce the works of the law of Moses, of the Decalogue, the rules of Benedict, Augustine, or others, rejects the promises of Christ, and falls away from him and his grace.

Your Imperial Majesty, however, and all the princes and estates (representatives) of the empire, will here observe the excessive impudence of our adversaries, who have the insolence to assert, that all our objections to monasticism are wicked, whereas we produced positive and plain declarations from Paul, and nothing in the whole Bible is taught more clearly and positively, than the remission of sins through faith in Christ alone. Now it is this indubitable, divine truth, that the authors of the Confutation—these abandoned wretches—dare to call wicked doctrine. But we entertain no doubt that your Imperial Majesty and the princes, after being apprised of this fact, will have this palpable blasphemy erased from the Confutation.

But as we have amply shown above, that it is an error, to teach that we obtain the remission of sins on account of our own merits, we shall now be the more brief; for every intelligent reader can easily perceive that we cannot be redeemed from death and from the power of the devil, nor obtain the remission of sins by the miserable works of the monks. Hence the blasphemous, detestable language in the writings of Thomas, that "entering into a cloister is a new baptism, or equal to it," is utterly intolerable. For it is a gross satanic error, to compare an unholy human ordinance, having no divine authority or promise, with holy Baptism, which is accompanied by the promise of divine grace.

In the second place, these things, namely, voluntary poverty, obedience, and chastity, provided the latter be pure, are all indifferent, bodily exercises, neither sinful nor righteous in themselves. Consequently such holy men, as St. Bernard, Francis, and others, employed them otherwise, than the monks at present. They used these things to exercise their bodies, that they might attend more easily to teaching, preaching, and similar duties; not because they regarded these works as services, that would justify them before God, or merit eternal life. Paul correctly describes these works, when he says: "Bodily exercise profiteth little," 1 Tim. 4, 8. It may be, that in some monasteries there are a few pious men, who

read and study, and sincerely observe these rules and ordinances, it being understood, that they do not regard their monasticism as holiness. But the doctrine that these works are a divine service, by which we become righteous before God, and merit eternal life, is directly opposed to the Gospel and to Christ. The Gospel teaches that we are justified and obtain eternal life by faith in Christ. It is also contrary to the words of Christ: "In vain do they worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. 15, 9; and opposed to the declaration of Paul: "For whatsoever is not of faith is sin," Rom. 14, 23. How, then, can they assert that these services are pleasing and acceptable to God, when they have no divine authority to this effect?

What gross hypocrisy and impudence are practised by our adversaries, when they not only assert that their monastic vows and orders are services, which justify and make them righteous before God, but also that they are states of perfection; that is, more holy and exalted than other conditions in life, such as matrimony, or the office of rulers. Besides these there are many other monstrous, heretical opinions connected with their monastic hypocrisy and Pharisaism. They boast that they are the most holy people, who observe not only the precepts, but even the counsels, that is, what the Scriptures do not enjoin, in regard to special gifts, as a law, but simply recommend or advise. Again, they imagine that their merit and holiness leave them a surplus; and then these pious saints are so liberal, as to offer their supererogatory merits to others, and to sell them for an equivalent in money. All this is a perfect caricature of holiness, mere Pharisaic hypocrisy and deceit.

Now the first commandment of God:—"Thou shalt love the Lord thy God with all thy heart, and with all thy soul," &c.—, is exalted above the comprehension of man; and it is the fundamental theology, out of which all the Prophets and Apostles drew their best and most elevated doctrines, as out of a fountain; yea, it is so high a commandment, that all divine services, all worship, all offerings, all thanksgivings in heaven and on earth, must be regulated and governed by it, so that all religious services, no matter how noble, precious, and holy they may appear, are nothing but empty husks, if they deviate from this commandment; nay, mere filth and abomination in the sight of God. This high commandment all the saints were so far from fulfilling completely, that even Noah and Abraham, David, Peter, and Paul, therein acknowledged themselves imperfect and sinners, and were compelled to remain in this humble position. It is therefore extraordinary, Pharisaic, nay, satanic arrogance for

a contemptible friar, or any base hypocrite of this kind, to proclaim that he has so perfectly fulfilled this high and holy commandment, and done so many good works according to the will of God, as to have a surplus of merit remaining. Ye precious hypocrites, well might ye thus boast, if the holy Decalogue and the great first commandment of God could be fulfilled as easily, as your bags are filled with bread and remnants. They are impudent hypocrites, with whom the world is plagued in these latter days.

Psalms 116, 11, David says: "All men are liars;" that is, no man on earth, not even the saints, regards or fears God as much, or believes and trusts in him as perfectly as he should, &c. It is therefore a mere hypocritical fiction of the monks, that they boast of living in perfect accordance with the Gospel and the commandments of God, or of doing more than they are in duty bound to perform, and that they have an abundance of good works and superfluous holiness in store.

It is equally false and fictitious, to claim that monastic life is a fulfilment of the counsels or advices given in the Gospel. For the Gospel nowhere advises such distinction of clothing, or meats, or the oppression of the people by such exactions; for these are simply human ordinances, of which Paul says: "But meat commendeth us not to God," 1 Cor. 8, 8. Consequently, they are not justifying services in the sight of God, nor are they evangelical perfection; but when set forth under these pompous titles, they are really what Paul calls them, "doctrines of devils," 1 Tim. 4, 1.

Paul commends continence, and by way of advice recommends it to those who have this special gift, mentioned above. It is therefore an infamous, wicked error to maintain that evangelical perfection consists in the ordinances of men. Then might the Mahometans and Turks also boast of possessing evangelical perfection; for they also have hermits and monks, as we learn from authentic history. Nor does evangelical perfection consist in non-essential or indifferent things; for as the kingdom of God consists in the light, purity, and strength imparted to our hearts by the Holy Spirit, to work new enlightenment and life in them, true evangelical, Christian perfection, therefore, is the daily increase of faith, of fear to God, and faithful attention to our vocations. Thus Paul describes perfection, saying: "We are changed into the same image, from glory to glory, even as by the Spirit of the Lord," 2 Cor. 3, 18. He does not speak of passing from one order to the other, or of putting on this cap now, and another then, or of wearing different girdles, cords, &c. It is lamentable that such Pharisaic, nay, Turkish and Mahometan

doctrine has obtained in the Christian church, claiming that evangelical perfection and the kingdom of Christ, in which the blessings of heaven and everlasting life begin here below, consist in hoods, garments, meats, and similar puerile works.

But let us further hear what palpable blasphemy and execrable language these excellent teachers have put into their Confutation. They have the impudence to say, "That it is written in the holy Scripture, that monastic life and the holy orders merit eternal life, and that Christ has promised these in superabundance, especially to the monks, who thus forsake house and home, brother and sister." These are the plain words of our antagonists. What a shameless, hateful falsehood, to say that it is written in the holy Scripture, that we can merit eternal life by monasticism! What audacity! Where does the Bible speak of monastic life? Thus do our adversaries discuss these important matters, and misapply the Scripture. The whole world knows, and history demonstrates, that the monastic orders are entirely new; and yet they boastingly claim that they are scriptural things.

Moreover, they blaspheme Christ, by affirming that eternal life can be merited by living in cloisters. God does not ascribe, even to his own commandments, the honor of meriting eternal life by the works of the law; for he clearly says: "Wherefore I gave them also statutes that were not good, and judgments whereby they should not live," Eze. 20, 25, 26. Now, in the first place, it is certain that no one can merit eternal life by monasticism; but it is given for Christ's sake, in pure mercy, to those who obtain the remission of sins through faith, and who hold this faith, not their beggarly merits, as a shield against the judgment of God. St. Bernard has well said, "that we cannot obtain the remission of sins, except through the grace of God; that we can have no good works whatever, unless he grant them; and that we cannot merit eternal life by works, but that it also is given to us through grace." St. Bernard says much to this effect, and finally adds: "Therefore let no one deceive himself; for if we properly reflect on this matter, we shall certainly find that we cannot, with ten thousand, meet God coming against us with twenty thousand." Now, as we do not, even by the works of the divine law, merit remission of sins or eternal life, but must seek the mercy promised in Christ, much less do we merit them by monasticism, which consists altogether of human ordinances, and less still should the honor be assigned to these beggarly ordinances.

Those who teach that we can merit the remission of sins by monasticism, and place their confidence, which belongs to Christ

alone, in these miserable ordinances, trample under foot the holy Gospel and the promises of Christ, honoring their shabby cowls and foolish monastic works, instead of Christ the Savior. And though they themselves are destitute of grace, these ungodly and wicked men devise their *merits of supererogation*, and sell their superabundant claim on heaven to others.

We shall dwell the more briefly on this subject here, since the foregoing remarks in reference to repentance, justification, human ordinances, &c., plainly show that monastic vows are not the means by which we are redeemed, and obtain everlasting life, &c. And as Christ himself calls these statutes vain worship, they are in no wise evangelical perfection.

A few reasonable monks, however, hesitated to extol their recluse life as Christian perfection, and moderated this excessive praise by saying that it is not Christian perfection, but designed to encourage it. Gerson also refers to this moderate view, and rejects the unchristian assertion, that monasticism is Christian perfection.

Now, if monastic life be simply a state in which to seek perfection, it is no *more* than the condition of the husbandman, the mechanic, &c. All these are conditions of life, in which Christian perfection may be sought; for all men, no matter what position they may occupy, should in their respective vocations, aim at perfection, while this life continues, and constantly increase in the fear of God, in faith, in love towards their neighbors, and like spiritual graces.

We read in the "Lives of the Fathers," that St. Antonius and other distinguished hermits were finally taught by experience, that their ascetic works did not make them more righteous in the sight of God, than the works belonging to other spheres of life. St. Antonius once entreated God to show him how far he had advanced in perfection, when he was referred to a shoemaker in Alexandria, and told that he was equal to this mechanic in holiness. Antonius the next day set out for Alexandria, conversed with the shoemaker, and anxiously inquired in what his holy life consisted. The shoemaker replied:—I am doing nothing particular; in the morning I offer up my prayer for the whole city, then I work at my trade, attend to my house-hold affairs, &c. Antonius at once saw what God meant by this revelation, namely, that we are not justified before God by this or that mode of life, but solely by faith in Christ.

Although our adversaries now hesitate to call the monastic life perfection, yet in fact they regard it as such; for they sell their works and merits, pretending that they observe not only the commandments, but also the counsels or recommendations of the Gospel,

and imagine that they even have superabundant merits. Now, is not this, in reality, boasting of perfection and holiness, notwithstanding the slight verbal modification of their pretensions? It is also clearly stated in the Confutation, that the monks live in closer conformity with the Gospel than laics. Now, if they think that it is living in closer conformity with the Gospel, to hold no property, to live in celibacy, to wear a particular garment or cowl, to fast and pray according to certain rules, it must be their opinion that monasticism is Christian perfection, since they claim that it more closely conforms to the Gospel, than the ordinary walks of life.

Again, the Confutation says that the monks obtain eternal life more abundantly than others, and refers to the passage: "Every one that hath forsaken houses, or brethren," &c., Matt. 19, 29. Here they also boast of the pretended perfection of monkery. But this passage does not speak of monastic life; for Christ means not that the desertion of father and mother, wife and children, house and home, merits the forgiveness of sins and eternal life; but on the contrary, such an abandonment of father and mother, so far from being in any way pleasing to God, is accursed and damnable in his sight. Any one abandoning parents and home, for the purpose of meriting the remission of sins and everlasting life, is a blasphemer of Christ.

But there are two kinds of desertion: the one is in compliance with the call and command of God; the other which bears the opposite character, is utterly displeasing to our Lord Jesus Christ. He calls the works of our own choice, vain and useless worship, Matt. 15, 9. This shows even more clearly, that Christ does not mean such a desertion of wife and children; he says, he who forsakes wife and children, house and home, &c. Now, we know that God forbids the desertion of wife and children. But the forsaking of parents, wife, children, &c., in obedience to the command of God, widely differs from an arbitrary desertion. If tyrants would attempt to force us to deny the Gospel, and threaten to banish us, it is God's command that we should rather suffer injustice, rather be driven away from our wives and children, houses and homes, yea, rather submit to death. This kind of desertion Christ means; he therefore adds, "for the sake of the Gospel," which plainly shows, that he alludes to those suffering for the sake of the Gospel, not to those who arbitrarily forsake their wives and children. We are even bound to surrender our own lives for the sake of the Gospel. Now, it would be the height of folly to kill ourselves without being commanded of God to do so; and it is equally absurd to regard the

arbitrary desertion of wife and children, which is not commanded of God, as holiness and divine worship.

The reference of this passage to monastic life is, therefore, a gross perversion of the language of Christ. But perhaps the words, "they receive a hundred-fold in this life," might be applicable to the monks; for many become monks for the sake of a living, and to spend their days in idleness and luxury, when, though mendicants, they enter into rich monasteries. But while the whole monastic system is full of hypocrisy and deception, they also pervert the Scriptures, thus committing two-fold fearful sin: *first*, by deceiving the world with idolatry; *secondly*, by falsely quoting the name and Word of God, to gloss over their idolatry.

They also quote Matt. 19, 21: "If thou wilt be perfect, go and sell that thou hast, and give to the poor; and come and follow me." This passage has perplexed many, who imagined it to be the greatest holiness and perfection, to have no possessions, house or home. Now the Cynics, such as Diogenes, who would not live in a house, but lay in a tub, may extol such pagan holiness. Christian holiness rests upon much nobler ground than such dissimulation. The possession of property, house and home, belongs to the regulations of civil government, and has the sanction of God, for instance in the seventh commandment: "Thou shalt not steal," &c., Exod. 20, 15. Hence we are neither commanded nor advised in the Scriptures to forsake property, house, and home; for evangelical, Christian poverty does not consist in the abandonment of our property, but in not relying upon it; as, for instance, David was poor, even in the midst of great power and a great kingdom.

Inasmuch, then, as such abandonment of property is nothing but a human ordinance, it is a vain service. This monastic, deceptive poverty is therefore undeservedly applauded in the "*Extravagante*" [a Papal ordinance] of the Pope, which says: "The relinquishment of property of every kind for the sake of God, is meritorious, holy, and the way to perfection." When uninformed persons hear such extravagant encomiums, they imagine that it is unchristian to hold property. This gives rise to many errors and disturbances; Münzer was deceived by these eulogies, and many Anabaptists are led astray by them.

But, say they, Christ himself has called it perfection. We deny this; for they do violence to the text by not quoting it entirely. Perfection is obedience to Christ's command, "Follow me." The perfection of every Christian consists in following Christ, each according to his vocation. But their vocations are various: one is

called to rule ; another to be the head of a family ; a third to labor in the ministry. Now, although that young man was called to sell " what he had," his call does not concern others. So the call of David, to be a king, does not pertain to all men ; nor does Abraham's call to offer up his son, refer to others. Thus while the calls are various, the obedience should be the same. Perfection consists in obedience in our vocations, not in the assumption of a vocation not belonging to us, nor enjoined upon us by divine authority.

In the third place, one of the principal monastic vows enjoins chastity. Now, we have already stated, in treating of the marriage of priests, that no one can alter the natural or divine law by any statutes or monastic vows ; and as many are not endowed with the gift of continence, the vow is often most shamefully violated. Nor can any monastic vow or law change the commandment of the Holy Spirit, in whose name Paul says : " To avoid fornication, let every man have his own wife," 1 Cor. 7, 2. Hence monastic vows are not right in the case of those who have not the gift of continence ; for in their weakness they fall, and do worse than before. In reference to this point we have already said, and it is really a wonder that our adversaries, seeing into what great dangers and offences they lead the consciences of men, nevertheless madly insist upon these human ordinances, contrary to the express command of God, and will not see how severely Christ our Lord censures the Pharisees, who issued ordinances in opposition to God's precepts.

In the fourth place, the abominable abuse of the masses held for the living and the dead, should deter every one from monastic life. To this we add the invocation of the saints, which is wholly devoted to avarice, and to satanic abominations. We call this service an abomination, because, on the *one* hand, its object is filthy lucre ; and on the *other*, it leads to the substitution of the saints in the place of Christ, to their idolatrous worship, and their recognition as mediators before God. Thus the Dominicans in connection with the Fraternity of the Rosary, (to say nothing of the numberless silly dreams of other monks) established the most flagrant idolatry, which both friends and foes now deride. Again, they neither hear nor teach the Gospel, which preaches the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, true repentance, and truly good works, enjoined by the Word of God ; but they preach legends of saints and works of their own invention, by which Christ is suppressed. All this the bishops were willing to tolerate.

We shall not enlarge upon the innumerable, puerile ceremonies and foolish services, with the lessons, singing, and the like, which

might in part be tolerated, if kept within proper bounds, and engaged in for beneficial exercise, as lessons at school, and preaching, are designed for the benefit of the hearers. But they imagine that these various ceremonies are services by which the remission of sins is merited for themselves and for others; for this reason, they are continually introducing new ceremonies. Now, if they would so shape these church services and ceremonies, as to train youth and the people generally in the Word of God, short and thorough lessons would be much more useful than their endless bawling in the choir. Thus the whole monastic life is full of idolatry and hypocritical errors, contrary to the first and second commandments, and opposed to Christ. Besides, it is dangerous, because those connected with monasteries or cloisters, must knowingly assist in persecuting the truth. There are, consequently, many great reasons why good men should discard monastic life.

The canons themselves, moreover, declare those free, who were persuaded by enticing words, before they had arrived at a proper age, or who were forced into monasteries by their friends. From all this it appears, that there are many reasons, showing that the monastic vows, hitherto made, are not really Christian and binding. Monastic life may therefore be abandoned with a clear conscience, since it is full of hypocrisy and every species of abomination.

Our adversaries cite the Nazarites under the law of Moses, (Num. 6, 2, &c.,) as testimony against us. But *they* made no vows with a view of obtaining the remission of sins by them, as we have charged in reference to monastic vows. The order of the Nazarites was designed for bodily exercise in fasting and certain meats, as a profession of their faith—not to obtain the remission of sins, or to be saved from eternal death by them; for this they sought elsewhere, namely, from the promise of the blessed seed. Again, no more than circumcision, or the slaying of victims, under the law of Moses, should be established now as a divine service, can the fasting or ceremonies of the Nazarites be set up or referred to as such a service; but they must be regarded as matters of indifference and as bodily exercises. Accordingly they neither can nor should compare their monasticism—devised as it was, without the authority of God's Word, as a service reconciling God—with the order of the Nazarites, which God had instituted, and which was not designed to enable the Nazarites to obtain the mercy of God, but as an external discipline and exercise of the body; like other ceremonies in the law of Moses. This answer will apply to the various other vows, laid down in the law of Moses.

Our opponents also adduce the example of the Rechabites, who held no property and drank no wine, as Jeremiah says, ch. 35. What a striking coincidence between the example of the Rechabites and our monks, whose monasteries are built more magnificently than the palaces of kings, and who live in the greatest splendor! But the Rechabites, in all their poverty, married; the monks, while surrounded with the greatest luxury, make hypocritical pretensions to chastity.

Now, intelligent and learned men well know, that all cases should be quoted and explained according to the rule, that is, according to the plain Scripture, and not contrary to it. Therefore, while the Rechabites are commended in the Word of God, it is certain that they did not observe their customs and ceremonies in order thereby to merit forgiveness of sins or eternal life, or because they thought that their works in themselves could justify them before God; but like pious, godly children they believed in the blessed seed, in the coming Christ; and as they had received the commandments of their parents, their obedience, to which the fourth commandment refers—"Honor thy father and thy mother"—is praised in the Scriptures.

There was, moreover, another reason for the practices of the Rechabites. They having been among the heathens, their fathers wished to distinguish them from the Gentiles by certain signs, so that they might not fall back into ungodliness and idolatry. He therefore designed by this means to admonish them to fear God, to exercise faith, and to remind them of the resurrection of the dead; and this was a good reason. But monasticism is based on quite different grounds. It is imagined to be a divine service, meriting the remission of sins and reconciling God. Hence it will bear no comparison to the example of the Rechabites, to say nothing about the other innumerable evils and offences still connected with monastic life.

They also cite, from the first Epistle to Timothy, 5, 11 and 12, the passage concerning the widows who served the church, and were supported from the common church-property, where Paul says: "For when they have begun to wax wanton against Christ, they will marry; having damnation, because they have cast off their first faith." Even admitting that the Apostle is here speaking of vows, (which is not the case,) still this passage does not show that monastic vows are Christian; for they are designed to be a divine service, through which to merit the forgiveness of sins. But Paul rejects all laws, works, and services performed with this view, and to

gain eternal life, which we obtain through Christ alone. It is certain, then, that if these widows made any vows, they were unlike the present monastic profession.

Moreover, if our adversaries insist upon such a perversion of this passage, they must also admit that Paul forbids "a widow to be taken into the number, under threescore years old," 1 Tim. 5, 9. Consequently, all monastic vows which were made by persons under this age, are null and void. But at that time the church knew nothing of these monastic vows. Now, Paul does not reprove widows because they married (for he bids the younger women to marry); but because they received support from the common church-treasury, abusing it in their levity and wantonness, and thus casting off their first faith. This he calls "casting off the first faith," not of their monastic vows, but of their baptism, their Christian duty, their Christianity. Thus he also says of faith, in the same chapter, verse 8: "But if any provide not for his own, especially for those of his own house, he hath denied the faith." Paul's views of faith differ from those of the sophists; for he says, that those have denied the faith, who do not provide for their own house. Thus he also says of women who are "tattlers and busybodies," that they cast off the faith.

We have thus set forth and refuted some of the arguments of our adversaries, and have done so not only on account of our adversaries, but rather for the sake of some pious Christians, so that they may clearly perceive why monastic vows and the various practices of monasticism are neither right nor Christian; all of which are overthrown by the single declaration of Christ: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. 15, 9. These words alone are a summary proof, that the whole of monkery, with its hoods, cords, girdles, and all its self-devised holiness, are useless and vain services in the sight of God; and all pious Christians should rest perfectly assured, that this is a Pharisaic, execrable, and damnable error, to believe that we obtain the forgiveness of sins, or eternal life, by such monkish practices, rather than by faith in Christ.

Hence pious men, that were saved and preserved in monastic life, had finally to despair of all their monastic works, to regard all their works as filth, to condemn all their hypocritical services, and cleave to the promises of grace in Christ, as we see in the example of St. Bernard, who tells us: *Perdite vixi*, "I have lived sinfully." For God will accept no services, but those which he himself has established in his Word.

XIV. OF THE POWER OF THE CHURCH.

On this subject our adversaries raise a great clamor about the privileges and immunities, as they call them, of the clergy; and then come to this conclusion: "All," say they, "that is said in this article against the immunities of the church and of the priests, is of no account or force." But in this matter the framers of the Confutation are basely calumniating us; for there is nothing said in our Confession against the privileges of the church or of the priests, conferred upon them by the civil government, by emperors, kings, and princes; we teach on the contrary, that civil regulations and rights should be observed.

Would to God, that our adversaries would but once listen to the heart-rending complaints of all the churches, to the deep cries and groans of so many pious hearts. Our opponents do not forget the privileges of the church, or their worldly interests; but about the condition of the most important offices in the church they are unconcerned; they care not what is taught and preached, nor about preserving the proper use of the Sacraments; they ordain even the most stupid men. Thus the Gospel doctrine went to decay, the churches not being provided with qualified preachers. They forge traditions and impose intolerable burdens, that are ruinous to the soul, adhering more closely to their traditions than to the commandments of God. Many poor souls are now involved in doubt, not knowing what to do. It is therefore the duty of the prelates to hear what is right or wrong, to remedy abuses, to relieve souls from their distressing perplexity, and to remove the burden from the oppressed conscience. But their deeds are manifest: they issue edicts contrary to the plain truth; they exercise unheard-of tyranny against pious men, in order to support some of their traditions, which are evidently contrary to the Word of God. Now, as they boast of their privileges, they should of right remember the duties of their office, and hear the groans and complaints of many pious Christians, which God assuredly hears, and for which he will call the prelates to an account.

Nor does the Confutation reply to our arguments, but displays its genuine Papal character, claiming great power for the bishops, without proving it. Thus it says, that the bishops have authority to rule, to judge, to punish, to coerce, to make laws conducive to eternal life. In this manner the Confutation boasts of the power of the bishops, but without proof. The controversy turns upon the question whether the bishops have the power to make laws without

the authority of the Gospel, and to enforce them as divine services, meriting eternal life.

Our answer is: the doctrine of the remission of sins without merit for Christ's sake, by faith, must be maintained in the church, and equally so, the doctrine that all human ordinances are incompetent to reconcile God. Accordingly neither sin nor righteousness should be ascribed to meat, drink, clothing, and like things; for Paul says: "The kingdom of God is not meat and drink," Rom. 14, 17. The bishops have no power, therefore, to make ordinances, without authority from the Gospel, through which to obtain the remission of sins, or to establish divine services that can justify us before God, and to make their non-observance a mortal sin. All this is taught in the single passage in the Acts of the Apostles, 15, 9, 10, where Peter says: "The hearts are purified by faith." Besides, they forbid to put a yoke or a burden upon the disciples, saying that it is a dangerous thing. They also intimate that those who thus impose burdens on the church, sin most fearfully, oppose God, and tempt him; for they say: "Why tempt ye God?" This severe and earnest declaration of the Apostles, which should of right alarm them like a clap of thunder, is not at all taken to heart by our antagonists, who are attempting to maintain their own devices by force and violence.

They also condemn the fifteenth article, in which we assert that we cannot merit the forgiveness of sins by human ordinances; and they hold that human ordinances are useful and conducive to eternal life. But it is obvious that they afford the heart no solid consolation, and give it no new light or life, as Paul says, Col, 2, 22, that ordinances are of no avail in obtaining everlasting righteousness or eternal life; for they teach a difference in meats, clothing, and like things, which pass away in their use; but eternal life, which begins inwardly, by faith, in this life, is worked by the Holy Spirit in the heart, through the Gospel. Our adversaries, therefore, can never prove that we can merit eternal life through the ordinances of men.

Now, as the Gospel clearly forbids the imposition of such ordinances upon the church and the conscience, as means of obtaining the remission of sins, or as necessary parts of divine worship, and as indispensable to Christian holiness, or finally as obligations which cannot be neglected without incurring mortal sin, our adversaries can never show that the bishops have authority to establish such services to God.

But we have stated in our Confession what power the bishops have in the church. Those who now bear the name of bishops in

the church, altogether neglect their episcopal office as set forth in the Gospel; still they may be bishops according to the canonic law, which we are not disposed to depreciate. But we are speaking of true Christian bishops; and we are pleased with the old division, namely, that the power of the bishops consists in *potestate Ordinis* and *potestate Jurisdictionis*, that is, in the administration of the Sacraments, and in spiritual jurisdiction. Accordingly, each Christian bishop has *potestatem Ordinis*, that is, power to preach the Gospel and to administer the Sacraments; he also has the power of spiritual jurisdiction in the church, that is, authority to exclude those living in open vice, from the Christian congregation, and, when they repent, to receive them again, and absolve them. But they have no despotic power, that is, they cannot judge without positive law; nor have they royal power, that is, power over existing laws: but they are subject to the positive law and the express command of God, according to which they are to regulate their spiritual power and jurisdiction. Although they have such jurisdiction over public vice, still it does not follow, that they are authorized to establish new modes of worship. These two things are widely different. Besides, this jurisdiction does not extend over transgressions of their new laws, but solely over sins against the law of God; for the Gospel certainly does not establish a special, independent government for them.

True, we have stated in our Confession, that the bishops may establish ordinances to preserve order and decorum in the church, but not as necessary acts of worship. Nor must they be imposed as such upon the conscience; for Paul says, Gal. 5, 1: "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage." The observance of these external ordinances must therefore be left discretionary, so that they may not be regarded as essential to salvation. Nevertheless it is a matter of duty to avoid giving offence. Thus the Apostles, for the sake of good discipline, ordained many things in the church, which were altered in the course of time; but they instituted no ordinances as necessary or unalterable; for they certainly did not act contrary to their own writings and doctrine, in which they strenuously contend that no statutes should be imposed upon the church, as being essential to salvation.

This is a simple and clear exposition of human ordinances, to show that they are not necessary parts of worship, but yet should be observed, according to circumstances, to avoid offence. Many learned and illustrious men have held and taught this view in the

church; and certainly our adversaries cannot gainsay it. It is also equally certain, that the words of our Lord Jesus Christ: "He that heareth you, heareth me," Luke 10, 16, do not imply the ordinances of men, but are directly opposed to them. For the Apostles did not here receive a *mandatum cum libera*, that is, a general and unlimited command and authority, but the mandate was limited, namely, to preach, not their own word, but the Word of God, and the Gospel. And by the words: "He that heareth you, heareth me," the Lord would strengthen all men, as it was necessary that we should be fully assured that the written and the preached Word is the power of God, and that no one need seek or to expect another word from heaven. Therefore, the declaration, "He that heareth you, heareth me," cannot be applied to human ordinances; for here Christ would tell them so to teach, that through their mouth Christ himself may be heard. Now, if this is to be done, they must not preach their own, but *his* Word, his voice and Gospel. This consolatory declaration, which most forcibly confirms our doctrine, and contains much useful instruction and comfort for the Christian, is referred by these simpletons, to their foolish ordinances, to their meat, drink, clothing, and similar puerile things.

They also quote Heb. 13, 17: "Obey them that have the rule over you," &c. This passage requires obedience to the Gospel; it does not confer any special authority or lordly power, independent of the Gospel, upon the bishops; hence they should not make statutes contrary to the Gospel, nor explain them contrary to it; for when they do this, the Gospel forbids us to obey them, as Paul says, Gal. 1, 8: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other gospel unto you, than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

In the same manner we also reply to the passage, Matt. 23, 2, 3: "The scribes and Pharisees sit in Moses' seat. All therefore whatsoever they bid you observe, that observe and do." Certainly this is no universal or general command to observe all they enjoin, even contrary to the command and Word of God. For the Scriptures elsewhere say: "We ought to obey God rather than men," Acts 5, 29. Hence, when their teachings are contrary to the Gospel, we should not listen to them. Nor does this passage establish a government apart from the Gospel; consequently they cannot prove by the Gospel, the power which they have established without it, for the Gospel does not speak of traditions, but of teaching the Word of God.

But the slanderous charge of our adversaries against us, in the conclusion of their Confutation, that this doctrine gives occasion for

disobedience and other offences, cannot justly be made against our doctrine; for it is obvious that it refers to the civil government in terms of the highest commendation. And it is known, that where this doctrine is preached, the authorities have too, by the grace of God, hitherto been duly honored by the subjects.

But as it regards the disunion and dissensions existing in the church, it is well known how they originated, and that they were occasioned by the retailers of indulgences, who unblushingly preached intolerable lies without shame, and then condemned Luther, because he did not approve these falsehoods. Besides, they were constantly agitating other controversies, so that Luther was led to assail other errors also. But as our opponents would not tolerate the truth, and even undertake to sustain palpable errors by violence, it is easy to judge who caused the separation. Indeed the whole world, all wisdom, and all power, should yield to Christ and his holy Word; but the devil, being the enemy of God, arrays all his power against Christ, to suppress and quench the Word of God. Thus the devil, with his members, setting himself against God's Word, is the cause of division and disunion; for we have most earnestly sought peace, and still most anxiously desire it, provided we are not forced to blaspheme and deny Christ. God, the judge of all hearts, knows that we have no pleasure nor peace in this fearful disunion. Nor have our opponents as yet been willing to make peace, unless we would agree to drop the blessed doctrine of the remission of sins through Christ, without our merit, which would be the grossest blasphemy against Christ.

And although we do not deny, that, as usual, the wickedness and imprudence of some, may have given offence in this schism (for thus the devil seeks to disgrace the Gospel); yet all this is nothing in comparison with the great consolation which this doctrine affords, by teaching that we receive the remission of sins and the grace of God for Christ's sake, without merit of our own; and by informing us, that it is not serving God, to forsake one's temporal position, or civil office, but that such relations are acceptable to God,—truly holy and divine services.

If we should also state the offences given by the opposite party, a task for which we certainly have no inclination, it would make a fearful record indeed, namely, how they turned the mass into a scandalous, blasphemous fair; what unchastity was caused by their celibacy; how the Popes have waged war upwards of four hundred years with the emperors, forgetting the Gospel, and striving only to be emperors themselves, and to obtain the control of all Italy;

how they sported with the church-property ; how, in consequence of their negligence, many false doctrines and religious services were established by the monks ; for what is their worship of saints but palpable, heathenish idolatry ? None of their writers say a word about the faith in Christ, through which the remission of sins is obtained : they ascribe the greatest holiness to human ordinances, about which they chiefly write and preach. Moreover, the spirit which they openly manifest, in murdering so many innocent, pious men now on account of their Christian principles, may properly be counted among their offences. But we shall not speak of this now ; for this matter should be judged according to the Word of God, without regard, in the mean time, to the offences of either party.

We hope that all godly men will satisfactorily learn from this book, that we teach Christian doctrine, and that our principles are consolatory and wholesome to all pious men. We therefore pray God to grant his grace, that his holy Gospel may be acknowledged and honored by all, to his praise, and to the peace, union, and salvation of all men. And we hereby declare our readiness, whenever it may be necessary, to give a further account of all these articles,

ERRATA.

Page 143—5th line from above, read: of it, for “of our confession”; 145—17th line from below, omit “they”; 158—10th l. below, read we, for “I”; 161—5th l. ab., desire, for “desires”; 162—5th l. bel., 23, for “53”; 166—2d l. bel., ; so, on the other hand, for “and again, reciprocally”; 172—17th l. ab., Now, by works no one, for “Now, no one by works”; 173—3d l. ab., work, for “worth”; 174—16th l. ab., we, for “they”; 181—7th l. ab., an amiable, lovely object, for “object, amiable, lovely”—6th l. bel., which, for “whom”; 198—16th l. ab., receive, for “obtain”; 199—10th l. ab., *επειξεσαν*, for “*επειξαν*”; 210—5th l. bel., hearts of men, for “heart of man”; 214—9th—10th l. ab., we believe ourselves, for “they believe themselves”; 226—5th l. ab., after “conscience,” insert: which; 251—9th l. ab., *canonicas*, for “*canonica*”—18th l. ab., works, for “werk”; 257—18th l. bel., for “that honor,” that the honor, &c.; 263—11th l. bel., after “God,” insert: in order, &c.; 263—8th l. ab., omit “but”; 271—19th l. bel., for “that it,” read: that such discipline, &c.; 283—5th l. bel., read: and in the Lord Jesus Christ, for “in Jesus, the Lord Christ”; 289—9th l. ab., omit “that”; 291—2d l. ab., omit “be able to”; 293—23th l. bel., omit “a”—and 18th l., omit “would willingly”—and 9th l., read: as has hitherto been, &c.; 291—6th l. ab., read: It is undoubtedly the divine will and right; 313—16th l. ab., read: has, for “have”; 318—7th l. ab., sacrifice, for “sacrifices”; 320—18th l. bel., after “satisfactory,” read: than nothing; 323—13th l. bel., read: number and price of masses; 331—4th l. bel., read: Are they evangelical perfection?; 333—2d l. ab., after “enemies,” insert: thus; 336—18th l. ab., read: or advice, &c.—and 16th l. bel., read: the, for “this”; 344—20th l. bel., at the end of the line substitute opponents for “adversaries.”

THE
SMALCALT ARTICLES.

ARTICLES OF CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE,

WHICH WERE TO BE EXHIBITED BY OUR ADHERENTS AT THE COUNCIL, IF A COUNCIL
HAD BEEN ASSEMBLED AT MANTUA, OR AT ANY OTHER PLACE, DECLAR-
ING WHAT POINTS WE COULD OR COULD NOT ADMIT OR ABANDON.

WRITTEN BY

DR. MARTIN LUTHER.

A. D. 1537.

THE SMALCALD ARTICLES.

PREFACE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER.

Last year pope Paul III. proclaimed a council, which was to be assembled about Pentecost at Mantua. Soon afterwards he transferred the appointed meeting from the city of Mantua to some other place; and it is not yet known where he intends to assemble it. We also had reason to hope that we should be summoned to the council, or to fear that, if not summoned, we might be condemned unheard. I was, therefore, required to collect and transcribe the articles of our doctrine, in order that it might appear, if the council should take place, what we might be able to concede to the Papists, and what points we were determined to maintain.

I have, accordingly, written these articles, and communicated them to our adherents, by whom they have been received and approved with great unanimity. It was also resolved that these articles should be publicly laid before the council,—if indeed the Pope and the Papists would hold a council, without false pretences and deceptive arts, in a lawful and Christian manner,—and that these should exhibit the confession of our faith.

But since the Roman court or conclave dreads a free and Christian council so very much, and so shamefully shuns the light, that even the Papists themselves have entirely lost the hope, not only of its ever assembling a Christian council, but even of its allowing or enduring any thing of the kind; many Papists even are justly offended, support this indifference of the Pope with reluctance, and naturally infer that he would rather see the destruction of Christianity itself, and the perdition of all souls, than the smallest reformation of his own errors, or those of his friends, or the prescription of any bounds to his tyranny. For this reason I have been the more desirous to publish these articles, that if I should die before a council shall be held,—an event which I truly expect, since those who fear and shun the light have labored so much in postponing and preventing the council,—posterity may have my testimony and confession, and may add this to that confession which I formerly published, to which I have constantly to this day adhered, and to which, by the grace of God, I will ever adhere.

What then shall I say? How shall I begin my complaint? I am still living, writing, holding deliberations, and reading public lectures daily; and yet these malignant men, not only among our adversaries, but even false brethren who pretend to agree with us, dare openly to turn my own writings and my own doctrine against me, whilst I am living, and whilst I see and hear them, although they know that I teach far differently. They wish to decorate their own venom with my labors, to deceive and entice wretched mortals under my name. What then, gracious God, will be done after my death?

I ought, indeed, to reply to all their charges, while I am yet living. But how can I alone close all the mouths of Satan?—especially of those, who, full of poison, do not wish to attend to or to hear what we have written, but are altogether engrossed by one purpose—that of perverting and corrupting our words at every point. To these, therefore, let Satan reply, and, finally, the wrath of God, as they deserve. I often recall to mind the excellent Gerson, who doubted whether any thing of public utility ought to be written or published. If we refrain from writing, many souls will be neglected, which might have been rescued; but if we write, immediately the devil is at hand with lips of bitterness and abuse, infecting and poisoning every thing, and defeating the salutary object of the writing. It is manifest, however, what advantage they derive from these malignant representations. For since they have thus assailed us with false charges, and endeavored by means of these misrepresentations to retain the less informed among them, God has the more advanced his work, diminished their numbers and increased ours, and has thus confounded and still confounds them in consequence of their falsehoods.

I will relate an instance of this. There was a certain Doctor here at Wittenburg, sent from France, who publicly assured us, that the French monarch had been fully persuaded that there was no church, no magistracy, no wedlock among us, but that we all lived promiscuously, each according to his inclination. Tell me now, with what countenance will they look upon us at the tribunal of Christ, in the last judgment?—these defamers who have, by their virulent writings, disseminated charges so false, not only in France, but in other kingdoms? Christ the Lord and Judge of us all, knows that these men are uttering falsehoods, and that they always have been speaking falsely. His decision they will be compelled to hear in their turn. May God convert those who can be changed; may they repent; but others he will overwhelm with woe eternal.

To return to the subject: I could wish that a free and Christian council might at some time be assembled, that we might provide for many exigencies, and for the wants of many. Not that we need a council: for our churches, by the grace of God, through their purity of doctrine, by the correct use of the sacraments, and by their knowledge of the various relations of life and of good works, have been so much enlightened and confirmed, that we have no need of a council, nor can we hope or expect any improvement in these respects from a council. But in various bishoprics we behold so many parishes entirely destitute and deserted, that the heart of a good man must be almost crushed with grief. And yet neither the bishops nor the prebendaries consider how those wretched mortals live or die; yet Christ has died for them also, though these poor men cannot hear him speaking as a true shepherd with his sheep. And this causes me very seriously to fear that Christ himself will convene a council of angels against Germany, by whom we may be utterly destroyed, like Sodom and Gomorrah, since we so rashly mock him with the name and pretence of a council.

Besides these ecclesiastical matters so highly important, great abuses might also be corrected in our political condition: such as discords of the princes and estates of the empire. Usury and avarice have invaded us like a flood, and they are defended under the form of law. Insolence, immorality, pride,

luxury and extravagance in dress, excess, gaming, ostentation, a host of vices and crimes, the wickedness and contumacy of subjects, servants, and laborers, the enormous prices demanded by mechanics, hirelings, and countrymen, (and who can tell all!) have spread to such an extent, that they could not be reformed by ten councils and twenty diets.

If these abuses in church and state, which are perpetrated against God, should be discussed in a council, there would be abundant subjects for deliberation; nor would there be any necessity for jesting and idle consultations about the long gown, the various modes of rasure and tonsure, broad belts and girdles, mitres, caps, cowls, staves, and similar vanities of the bishops and cardinals. If we had sufficiently pondered the will and the command of God, in relation to the regulation of ecclesiastical and civil affairs, abundant time and opportunity would afterwards have been left for the reformation of diet and of dress, of wax tapers, razures, and cells. But because we swallow camels, and at the same time strain out gnats,—neglect the beam, and search for the mote,—we may do without a council.

I have, therefore, written but few articles. For we have already enough of the commands of God in the church, in the state, and in our families, which we shall never be able to observe completely. What benefit, then, can result from so great a number of decrees, traditions, and laws of a council, when the principal duties which God enjoins upon us, will not be regarded nor observed? Just as if God were forced to yield to our ridiculous fantasies, and to suffer, in the mean time, his holy commands to be trodden under foot. But our sins overburden us, nor do they permit God to be gracious, because we will not repent, but defend every kind of abomination.

O Christ Jesus, our Lord! Do thou thyself convene a council, and there preside. Deliver us by thy glorious presence. We have nothing to hope from the Pope and the bishops: they do not regard thee. Do thou, therefore, assist us, who are miserable and poor, who groan for thee, and seek thee from the heart, according to the grace which thou hast given to us, through the influence of the Holy Spirit who lives and reigns with thee and with the Father, blessed forever. Amen.

PART I.

ARTICLES CONCERNING THE DIVINE MAJESTY.

I.

That the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, three distinct persons, in one divine essence and nature, is one God, who made heaven and earth.

II.

That the Father is of no one, the Son is begotten of the Father, the Holy Ghost proceeds from the Father and the Son.

III.

That neither the Father nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son, became man.

IV.

That the Son thus became man, by being conceived of the Holy Ghost, without the interposition of man, and being born of the pure and holy Virgin Mary : he afterwards suffered, died, was buried, descended into hell, rose from the dead, ascended to heaven, sits at the right hand of God, will judge the living and the dead, &c. as the Apostolical and Athanasian Symbols, and the Smaller Catechism, teach.

There is no dispute nor contention about these articles ; and inasmuch as both parties confess them, it is unnecessary now to treat further of them.

PART II.

ARTICLES WHICH CONCERN THE OFFICE AND WORK OF JESUS CHRIST, OR OUR REDEMPTION.

ARTICLE I.—THE CHIEF ARTICLE.

That Jesus Christ, our God and our Lord, died for our sins, and was raised again for our justification, Rom. 4, 25.

And he alone is the Lamb of God, who bears the sins of the world, John 1, 29. And God has laid upon him the sins of us all, Isa. 53, 6.

Again, all have sinned, and are justified without works or merits, of their own, by his grace, through the redemption of Jesus Christ in his blood, &c., Rom. 3, 23, 24.

Inasmuch, then, as this must be believed, and since it cannot be obtained or embraced by works, law, or merit, it is clear and certain, that such faith alone justifies us, as Paul, Rom. 3, 28, says: "Therefore we conclude, that a man is justified by faith, without the deeds of the law." Again, verse 26, "That he might be just, and the justifier of him which believeth in Jesus."

Whatever may happen, though heaven and earth should fall, nothing in this article can be yielded or rescinded. "For there is none other name under heaven given among men, whereby we must be saved," says Peter, Acts 4, 12. "And with his stripes we are healed," Isa. 53, 5. Upon this article depends all that we teach and do against the Pope, the devil, and all the world. We must, therefore, be entirely certain of this, and not doubt it, otherwise all will be lost, and the Pope and the devil, and our opponents, will prevail and obtain the victory.

ARTICLE II.—OF THE MASS.

That the mass under Popery must be the greatest and most terrible abomination, since it is directly and strongly opposed to this chief article; and yet of all Papal idolatries it was the most embellished and applauded. For it was maintained that such offering, or work of the mass, even when performed by an artful knave, liberates men from sins, both in this life, and in purgatory,—a thing which the Lamb of God alone can do, as already said. No part of this article can be yielded or rescinded; for the first article will not allow it.

But if there be a rational Papist any where, we might speak to him in the following friendly manner:—*First*, why do you still adhere so strenuously to the mass, since it is a mere human device, not commanded of God? And we may safely abandon all human devices, as Christ, Matt. 15, 9, says: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

Secondly, it is an unnecessary thing, which we can omit without sin or danger.

Thirdly, we can, according to the institution of Christ, obtain the Sacrament in a far better and a more acceptable way, yea, this way is alone acceptable. What use is it, then, to force men into difficulty and misery, for the sake of a fictitious advantage, when we can have it otherwise more happily and better?

Let the doctrine be publicly preached to the people, that the mass as a human invention, may be left unobserved without sinning, and

that no one who does not observe it will be condemned, but may be saved without the mass and through better means, and we will venture to assert that the mass will then be discontinued of itself, not only among the illiterate populace, but also among all pious, sincere, and intelligent Christians; much more so, if they should hear that it is a dangerous thing, invented and devised without the Word and will of God.

Fourthly, inasmuch as incalculable and inexpressible abuses, resulting from the mercenary purposes to which the mass has been devoted, have obtained in all the world, it should be discontinued, for the purpose of restraining these abuses alone, even if the mass itself had something useful and good in it. How much rather, then, should we suffer it to cease, in order to prevent such abuse perpetually, since it is entirely unnecessary, useless, and dangerous, and since we can have every thing necessary and useful, with certainty, without the mass.

Fifthly, since the mass neither is nor can be any thing else,—as the canons and all the books declare,—but a work of man, (even of artful knaves,) by which each one wishes to reconcile himself and others to God, and to merit and obtain grace and remission of sins; for so, even at best, it is regarded—and how could it be otherwise?—consequently we should and must condemn and reject it. For this is directly in opposition to the chief article, which declares that neither a wicked nor a pious performer of mass, but the Lamb of God and the Son of God bears our sins.

And if any one, for the purpose of making a pious appearance, should pretend that he would, as a devotional exercise, give or administer the Lord's Supper to himself, there could be no sincerity in this; for if he had a sincere desire to commune, it could be administered to him best and most appropriately in the Sacrament, according to the institution of Christ. But for a person to administer the Sacrament to himself, is a human presumption, uncertain and unnecessary, as well as forbidden. Neither does he know what he is doing, since, without the Word of God, he follows false conceptions and fantasies of men. Nor would it be right, if all else were unexceptionable, for one to use the common Sacrament of the church according to his own caprice, and to sport with it at his pleasure, independently of the Word of God, and apart from the communion of the church.

This article, concerning the mass, will be the main point in the council. For if it were possible for them to yield to us in every other article, yet they cannot yield in this. As Campegius said at

Augsburg: "He would rather permit himself to be torn into pieces, than allow the mass to be discontinued." So would I rather, by the help of God, suffer myself to be reduced to ashes, than permit a performer of mass with his works, whether he be good or bad, to be equal or superior to my Lord and Savior Jesus Christ. Thus we are and remain eternally separated and opposed to each other. They truly feel, that if the mass falls, Popery will cease; before they would suffer this to come to pass, they would put all of us to death, if it were possible.

Moreover, this dragon tail of the mass, has produced a multiplicity of abominations and idolatries.

First, purgatory. Here such a traffic was carried on with requiems, vigils, the seventh, thirteenth, and annual celebrations, and finally with the congregation-weeks and all-souls-day, and soul-bath in purgatory, that the mass was used almost for the dead alone; yet Christ instituted the Sacrament for the living alone. Wherefore, purgatory, together with all its imposing aspects, its methods of worship, and its profits, should be regarded as a satanical delusion. For it is likewise contrary to the doctrine of the chief article, that Christ alone and not the works of men, should help our souls. And besides this, there is nothing commanded us or enjoined concerning the dead. For this reason we may justly omit it, even if it were not erroneous or idolatrous.

Here the Papists introduce Augustine and several Fathers, who, it is thought, have written concerning purgatory, under the impression that we do not perceive the purpose for which these passages are written. St. Augustine does not write that there is a purgatory, nor was there any Scripture to induce him to write to this effect, but he leaves it doubtful whether there is one; and he says: "His mother desired to be remembered at the altar and the Sacrament." Now, all this was nothing but the devotion of individuals, and established no article of faith,—a thing which pertains to God alone. But our Papists introduce such declarations of men, for the purpose of inducing men to place confidence in their shameful and execrable annual fairs, where the mass is offered for souls in purgatory. These opinions they will always fall far short of proving by the writings of St. Augustine. But whenever they shall have abolished this annual purgatorial fair, of which St. Augustine never dreamed, then we shall confer with them whether St. Augustine's words, independent of the Scripture, may be tolerated, and whether the dead should be remembered in the Sacrament. For when men frame articles of faith out of the deeds or words of the holy Fathers, it is of no avail;

for their manner of eating, clothing, houses, &c., would also thus become an article of faith, as was the case with the relics of saints. Nothing else but the Word of God, not even an angel, can properly establish articles of faith.

Secondly, evil spirits, with deception and falsehood unutterable, have practised many malignant and wicked artifices, by appearing as the souls of persons, exacting masses, vigils, pilgrimages, and alms. All of which we were compelled to observe as articles of faith, and to live according to their requisitions; and the Pope confirmed these things, as he also did the mass and all other abominations. Upon this point also we cannot yield, or concede any thing.

Thirdly, pilgrimages. Here masses, remission of sins, and divine favors, are sought; for the mass has introduced all these. Now, it is undoubtedly certain that these pilgrimages, instituted without the Word of God, are not enjoined upon us; nor are they necessary, while we can enjoy a better state of affairs, and since we may abandon them without sinning and incurring danger. Why, then, do men forsake their own preachers, the Word of God, their wives and children, &c.,—the care of these being necessary and commanded,—and follow after useless, uncertain, and pernicious phantoms of the devil? Unless because the devil has prompted the Pope to commend and confirm this procedure, in order that multitudes of people might fall from Christ, rely on their own works, and become idolatrous, which is its worst consequence, especially, as it is useless, not commanded, or advised, but uncertain, as well as most pernicious. Upon this subject, therefore, we cannot yield or concede any thing. And let it be preached that such procedure is unnecessary as well as dangerous, and it shall then be seen in what estimation pilgrimages will stand.

Fourthly, fraternities. Here the convents, canonries, and vicarages, have made over by writing, and conveyed by fair and lawful sale, all the masses, good works, &c., both for the living and the dead,—a transaction which is not merely a human contrivance, unsupported by the Word of God, uncommanded and useless, but repugnant also to the first article concerning redemption; therefore it cannot by any means be tolerated.

Fifthly, relics of saints. Under this name the grossest falsehoods are circulated, and egregious impositions practised with the bones of domestic animals. An imposition so dishonest, worthy to excite even the derision of Satan, should long since have been exploded; and indeed if even *some* beneficial result had attended it, yet unadvised, unauthorized by the Word of God, it would still be utterly

useless and unnecessary. But like the mass, this was its worst feature,—people were bound to believe it capable of securing pardon and the remission of sins.

Sixthly, here indulgences present themselves, which are offered both to the living and the dead, yet for money, for which this sacrilegious Judas, the Pope, sells the merits of Christ, together with the superfluous merits of all saints, and of the whole church. All of which is intolerable, and not only without the authority of God's Word, and without an adequate motive or command, but also repugnant to the first article. For the merits of Christ cannot be obtained by our works or money, but by grace through faith, without any money or merit; not through the power of the Pope, but through the preaching of the Word of God, are they held forth and offered to us.

Of the Invocation of Saints.

The invocation of saints is also an antichristian abuse, repugnant to the first chief article, and destructive of the knowledge of Christ. It is likewise neither commanded nor advised, and is without example in Scripture. And all things are more abundantly offered unto us in Christ, so that we have no need for the invocation of saints, even if there were something good and precious connected with it, which, however, is not the fact.

And although angels in heaven pray for us, (as Christ himself also does,) and also saints on earth, perhaps also in heaven; it still does not follow that we should invoke angels and saints, adore them, fast on account of them, hold holidays and masses for them, sacrifice unto them, establish churches and altars, and institute divine services for them, attributing all manner of assistance to them, and assigning unto each one a particular office, as the Papists teach and do; for this is idolatry, and such honor pertains to God alone. For you as a Christian and a saint, can pray for me here on earth, not only in a single instance, but in every time of need. But I should not, therefore, invoke, adore, and solemnize you, fast, sacrifice, and hold masses in your honor, and place in you my faith and hope of salvation. I can otherwise truly honor, love and thank you in Christ. Now, if such idolatrous worship of angels and dead saints, were abolished, other honors would be harmless, yes, soon forgotten. For if advantage and assistance, both temporal and spiritual, were no more to be expected, they would certainly leave the saints in peace, both in the grave and in heaven; for gratuitously, or through mere love, no one would either remember, esteem, or honor them much.

In short, the mass itself, that which results from it, and that which attaches to it, we cannot tolerate; and we must condemn it, in order that we may preserve the holy Sacrament pure and indubitable, according to the institution of Christ, and receive and use it in faith.

ARTICLE III.—OF CONVENTS AND OTHER INSTITUTIONS.

The convents and other institutions formerly established with good intentions, for the purpose of rearing learned persons, and chaste and modest females, should again be restored to this use, in order that we may have pastors, preachers, and officers in the church, and other persons competent to the administration of civil government, and also well educated women as wives and mothers, &c.

Where these institutions do not contribute to this object, it is better to leave them lying waste, or to pull them down, than that they should with their blasphemous services devised by men, be regarded as something better than the common condition of Christians, and as offices and orders instituted of God. For all this is also opposed to the first and chief article concerning the redemption through Jesus Christ. And besides, they are also, like all other human inventions, neither commanded, nor necessary, nor useful, but dangerous and productive of vain labor and trouble, as the Prophets call such services to God, *aven*, that is, labor.

ARTICLE IV.—OF POPERY.

The Pope is not *jure divino*, or according to the Word of God, the head of all Christendom, for this belongs to one alone, who is Jesus Christ; but he is only bishop, or pastor of the church at Rome, and of others who have voluntarily, or through human authority, (that is, through the political magistracy,) joined themselves to him, not under him, as a lord, but equal with him, Christians and his brethren and companions, as the ancient councils and the age of St. Cyprian, show.

But now no bishop is allowed to call the Pope brother, as was done in the days of Cyprian; but they, and even emperors and kings, must call him, "*most gracious lord*." This arrogance we cannot, with good conscience, nor will we, nor should we, approve. But whoever wishes to do so, may do it without consulting us.

Hence it follows, that all that the Pope through this false, arrogant, blasphemous, and usurped power, has done or undertaken, has been, and is still, a mere device and work of the devil, (excepting

that which concerns political government, in which God, even through a tyrant and a knave, often permits much good to be effected for a people,) to the perdition of the holy, universal, Christian church, (so far as it depended on him,) and to the destruction of the first chief article concerning the redemption secured by Jesus Christ.

For all his bulls and books are extant, in which he roars like a lion, (as the angel, Rev. 12, describes,) exclaiming that no Christian can be saved, unless he be obedient and subject to the Pope in all things that he wishes, says, or does. All of which is nothing else but asserting, that even if you believe in Christ, and are in possession of all things in him that are essential to salvation, it avails nothing, and all is vain, if you do not hold me as your god, and are not subject and obedient to me. When at the same time it is evident, that the holy Christian church was without a Pope, upwards of five hundred years at least; and even to this day the Greek church and those of many other languages, have never been, and are not now, under the Pope. Consequently it is, as has been frequently said, a human device, unadvised, useless, and ineffectual; for the holy Christian church can exist without such head, and it might have existed in better circumstances, if such head had not been reared up by the devil. Nor is Popery of any use in the church; for it exercises no Christian office, and thus the Christian church must continue and stand without the Pope.

And supposing that the Pope would admit that he is not supreme, *jure divino*, or according to the command of God, but in order that the union of Christians might be the more effectually preserved against sectarians and heretics, that there might be a head to which all the others adhere: such head then would be elected by men, and it would lie within human choice or power, to change or to remove that head. The council at Constance adopted this method with the Popes, removing three, and electing the fourth. Supposing, I say, that the Pope and the see at Rome, would admit and accept this, (which however is impossible, for he would then be compelled to permit his whole government and ecclesiastical establishment to be subverted and destroyed, with all his rites and books,) even then the condition of Christianity would not be amended by it, and there would be more sectarians than before.

If then, we are not compelled according to the command of God to be subject to such head, but only according to the good pleasure of men, it would readily and in a short time be rejected, and finally not retain a single member. Nor would it have to be always at Rome or at any other particular place, but where and in whatever church God

would raise up a man who might be qualified for this purpose. This indeed would constitute a perplexed, and confused state of affairs!

Therefore, the church can never be better governed and preserved, than by us all living under one head,—Christ,—the bishops being all equal with respect to their office, though unequal with respect to their endowments, and diligently adhering together in conformity of doctrine, faith, sacraments, prayer, and works of love, &c., as St. Jerome writes, that the priests at Alexandria ruled the church in one collective body; and so did the Apostles, and all bishops in the whole circle of Christianity, until the Pope elevated his head above all.

This fact proves fully that he is opposed to Christ, or is the true Antichrist, who has set himself against, and elevated himself above Christ, since he will not permit Christians to be saved without his power; nothing of which, however, is either ordered or commanded of God. This may with propriety be termed setting ones self above and against God, as Paul, 2 Thess. 2, 4, says. Neither Turks nor Tartars act in this way, as atrocious enemies as they are to Christians; but they allow those to believe in Christ who wish to do so, and they accept tribute and corporeal obedience from Christians.

But the Pope prohibits this faith, and says that men must be obedient to him, if they wish to be saved. This we are unwilling to do, but will rather die in the name of God. All this has resulted from the compulsion of calling him the supreme ruler, with divine right, over the Christian church. Therefore, he had to make himself equal with Christ, and above him, declaring himself the head, afterwards lord of the church, and finally of the whole world; boasting as if he were a terrestrial god, till he even undertook to command the angels in heaven. And when a line of distinction is drawn between the doctrine of the Pope, and that of the holy Scripture, or when they are held in comparison, it will appear that the Pope's doctrine, even in its best features, is taken from imperial and pagan rights: and it has reference to political affairs and jurisdiction, as his decretals prove. Accordingly, it teaches ceremonies concerning churches, vestments, meats, persons, and puerile plays of masks and mummeries without measure: but in all this there is nothing about Christ, faith, and the commandments of God.

Finally, he acts as the devil himself, when in opposition to God, the Pope urges and disseminates his falsehoods concerning masses, purgatory, monastic life, self-devised works, and services to God,—which constitute true Popery,—and tortures and puts to death all Christians, who will not regard and honor these abominations of his above all things. Therefore, as little as we can adore the devil as

a lord or god, so little can we tolerate his apostle, the Pope or Antichrist, as head and lord in his kingdom. For falsehood and murder, eternal destruction of body and of soul, is his Papal government chiefly,—this I have shown in many of my books.

In these four articles they will have enough to condemn at the council; for they cannot and will not concede to us the least member of a single one of these articles. For this we must be prepared, and animate ourselves with the hope that Christ our Lord has assailed his adversaries, and will pursue them with his Spirit and with his judgment. Amen.

For at the council we shall not, as at Augsburg, stand before the Emperor, or temporal authority, who published a very gracious summons, and permitted matters to be investigated in kindness; but we shall stand before the Pope and the devil himself, who does not intend to listen, but merely to condemn, to murder, and force us into idolatry. Therefore we dare not here kiss his feet, or say: You are my gracious lord; but as the angel in Zechariah 3, 2, said: *God rebuke thee, Satan.*

PART III.

CONCERNING THE FOLLOWING POINTS OR ARTICLES WE MAY TREAT WITH LEARNED, SENSIBLE MEN, OR AMONG OURSELVES. THE POPE AND HIS KINGDOM DO NOT CONCERN THEMSELVES MUCH ABOUT THEM. FOR WITH THEM CONSCIENCE IS A TRIFLING MATTER. BUT THE THINGS WHICH THEY ESTEEM ARE GOLD, HONOR, AND POWER.

I. OF SIN.

Here we must confess, as Paul says, Rom. 5, 12, that sin entered by one man, Adam, by whose disobedience all persons became sinners, subject to death and the devil. This is called hereditary, or original sin.

The fruits of this sin are the following evil deeds, forbidden in the Decalogue; as, unbelief, false faith, idolatry, want of fear to God, arrogance, desperation, blindness; and in short, ignorance and disrespect of God; finally, falsehood, abusing the name of God, impiety, irreverence, disrespect for the Word of God, disobedience to parents, murder, incontinence, theft, fraud, &c.

This hereditary sin is a corruption of nature so deep and evil, that it cannot be understood by the reason of any man, but it must be believed from the revelations of Scripture, Psalm 51, 7; Rom. 5, 12; Exod. 33, 3; Gen. 3, 7. Therefore, these dogmas of the schoolmen

are mere errors and blindness contrary to this article, in which they teach :

“That after the fall of Adam, the natural powers of man remained whole and uncorrupted, and that man by nature has right reason and a good will, as philosophy teaches.

“And that man has freedom of will to do good, and omit evil, and on the contrary, to omit good, and do evil.

“Again, that man by his own natural powers, is able to observe and do all the commandments of God.

“And, that he is able by his own natural powers, to love God above all things, and his neighbor as himself.

“Again, if a person does as much as lies in his power, God will certainly grant him His grace.

“And if he wishes to approach the Eucharist, it is not necessary for him to have a good intention to do good, but it is sufficient for him not to have a bad intention to commit sin ; so entirely good is nature, and so efficacious is the Sacrament.

“Again, it is not founded in the Scripture, that the Holy Ghost with his grace, is necessarily required to a good work.”

These and many other similar points, have originated from a misapprehension and an ignorance both of sin and of Christ, our Savior, and they are truly heathen doctrines, which we cannot tolerate. For if this doctrine should be right, Christ died in vain, since there would be no injury or sin in man, for which he should have died ; or he would have died for the body only, and not for the soul, since the soul would be sound, and death pernicious only to the body.

II. OF THE LAW.

Here we maintain that the law was given of God, first that sin might be prohibited by the menaces and terrors of punishment, and by the promises and annunciations of favors and reward. But all this on account of corruption, which works sin in man, proved ineffectual. For some became worse on account of it, namely, those who were enemies to the law, because it forbids that which they freely do, and commands that which they do not freely perform. Wherefore, unless restrained by punishment, they do more now against the law than before. These are rude, and wicked people, who commit evil, wherever occasion and opportunity permit.

Others become blind and arrogant, imagining that they observe, and are able to keep the law by their own powers, as said above in the quotations from the schoolmen. Hence originate hypocrites and false saints.

But the principal office or energy of the law is, to reveal original sin with all its fruits, and to show unto man how entirely and deeply his nature has fallen, and how utterly and totally depraved it is; so that the law must say to him, that he has not the true God, nor regards him, but adores other gods,—which he would not before, and without the law, have believed. On account of this, he is alarmed and humbled; he desponds and despairs; he anxiously desires help, and knows not from what source it is to come; he begins to be at enmity with God, and to murmur. Then, it may be said, *the law worketh wrath*, Rom. 4, 15: *sin became greater through the law*, Rom. 5, 13, 20.

III. OF REPENTANCE.

This office of the law the New Testament retains, and enforces, as Paul does, Rom. 1, 18, saying: “For the wrath of God is revealed from heaven against all ungodliness and unrighteousness of men.” Again, chap. 3, verses 19 and 20: “That all the world may become guilty before God.” And Christ, John 16, 9, says: “The Holy Ghost will reprove the world of sin.”

This is, then, the thunder-bolt of God, by which he prostrates both open sinners and pretended saints, and pronounces none of them just, but drives all of them into fear and desperation. This is the hammer, as Jeremiah 23, 29, says: “Is not my word like a hammer that breaketh the rock in pieces.” This is not *active contritio*, an affected contrition, but *passive contritio*, true sorrow of the heart, a passion and feeling of death.

And this is then a commencement of true repentance; and here man must hear such a sentence as this: Your claims are nothing, whether you be notorious sinners, or saints in your *own* opinion; you must all become otherwise and act otherwise than you now are and act, no matter who and how great, how wise, how powerful, or how holy you may be; here no one is pious.

But to this office the New Testament instantly subjoins the consolatory promises of grace through the Gospel, which we should believe, as Christ, Mark 1, 15, says: “Repent ye, and believe the Gospel;” that is, become and act otherwise, and believe my promises. And before Christ, John was called a preacher of repentance, but for remission of sins; that is, he should reprove all of them, and convict them of sin, so that they might know what they were in the sight of God, and recognize themselves as lost persons, and thus be prepared unto the Lord to receive his grace, and to await and

accept remission of sins from him. Thus Christ himself also, Luke 24, 47, says: "That repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations."

But wherever the law exercises this office alone, without an annexation of the Gospel, *there* is death and hell, and man must despair, as Saul and Judas did, as Paul says, that the law puts to death through sin, Rom. 7, 10. On the contrary, the Gospel offers consolation and forgiveness, not only in one way, but through the Word, the sacraments, and the like, as we shall hear; so that the redemption is indeed abundant with God,—as the 130th Psalm, verse 7, says,—against the great oppression of sins.

But now we must contrast the false repentance of the sophists with true repentance, in order that both may be the better understood.

Of the false repentance of the Papists.

Impossible was it for them to teach correctly concerning repentance, because they did not perceive the true sins; for, as already said, they formed improper conceptions in reference to hereditary sin, asserting that the natural powers of man remained whole and uncorrupted, that reason is able to teach correctly, that the will can act according to it, and that God will certainly grant his grace, if a person does as much as lies in his power, according to his freewill.

From this it must follow, that they repented only of actual sins; such as evil, voluntary thoughts, (for evil feelings, lust, irritations, were not sins,) evil words, evil works, which the free will could easily have avoided.

And they allege that in this repentance there are three parts:—contrition, confession, and satisfaction or expiation; with this consolation and promise, that if a person truly repent, confess, and make satisfaction, he has merited remission by these acts, and made compensation for his sins in the sight of God. Thus they directed the people in repentance, to a reliance on their own works. Hence originated this declaration on the pulpit,—when the common absolution was declared to the people:—"Prolong, Lord God, my days, till I repent of my sins and amend my life."

Here nothing was said in reference to Christ, and nothing was mentioned concerning faith, but they hoped to overcome and exterminate their sins in the sight of God, by their own works. With this view we also became priests and monks, so that we ourselves might resist our sins.

This method was also adopted in confession, inasmuch as no one could think of all his sins, (especially of all that were committed during the whole year,) they subjoined this idle fallacy: "If the sins which have escaped the memory, afterwards recur unto the mind, they must be repented of and confessed." In the mean time they were submitted to the grace of God.

Moreover, since no one knew the extent or degree of contrition, requisite in the sight of God, they gave this consolation: "Whoever cannot have contrition, should have attrition;" which we may term a half, or a commencement of contrition, for they did not understand either of these themselves, and even now know as little what they imply as I do. Such attrition, then, was accounted contrition, in coming to confession.

And when it so happened, that one said he could not have contrition, or sorrow for his sins, as might happen in profligate affection, or revenge, &c., they asked whether he did not wish, or freely desire, that he might have contrition? He then said, *yes*; for who would say *no* in this case? would the devil himself? Then they received this contrition, and remitted his sins on account of this his good work. Hence they alleged the example of St. Bernard.

Here we see how men, guided by blind reason, grope in divine things, and seek consolation in their own works according to their fancies, without being able to think of Christ or faith. When we view these things attentively, such contrition is only affected, and devised by man's own powers, without faith, without a knowledge of Christ; and in this contrition the poor sinner, when thinking of lust or revenge, would at times rather have laughed than mourned, excepting those who were really smitten by the law, or vainly afflicted by the devil with pensive minds; otherwise this contrition was really nothing but hypoerisy, and it did not mortify the lust of sin. For they were compelled to affect contrition, but if it had been left to their own choice, they would rather have sinned more.

This was the course pursued in confession: each one was compelled to enumerate all his sins,—which is a thing impossible,—this was a severe embarrassment; but those sins which had escaped his memory were remitted unto him so far, that if they recurred to him, he must still confess them. In this way he could never know when he had confessed sufficiently, or when his confession should once terminate; he was nevertheless referred to his own works, and thus consoled, namely, that the more completely he confessed, and the more he became ashamed, and the more he thus debased himself before the priests, the sooner and the better he made satisfaction for

sins, and that such humility certainly merits an impartation of God's grace.

Here there was neither faith nor Christ; the virtue of absolution was not explained to him, but his consolation consisted in the enumeration of sins and in self-abasement. But the torture, fraud, and idolatry, resulting from this confession, cannot be related.

Satisfaction or expiation was far more perplexing; for no person could know how much he should do for one sin alone, much less for all. Here they resorted to an artifice, namely, by imposing a small satisfaction which could be easily observed, as five *Paternosters*, one day's fasting, &c.; other things, which they said were required in repentance, they referred to purgatory.

This was also productive of great distress; for some thought that they never should be liberated from purgatory, because, according to the ancient canons, a repentance of seven years was assigned for one mortal sin. Still our dependance rested on our work of satisfaction; and if the satisfaction could have been complete, the dependance would have rested wholly upon it, and neither faith nor Christ would have been necessary,—but this was impossible. And if one had thus exercised penance a hundred years, he still could not have known when he would have effected a perfect and final penitence. This is to repent perpetually, yet never arrive at repentance.

Here then, the holy See of Rome came to the assistance of the miserable church, and devised indulgences, in which the Pope remitted and arrested the *satisfaction* or expiation, first for one year, for seven years, a hundred years, &c., and distributed them among the cardinals and bishops, so that one could grant indulgence for a hundred years, another for a hundred days. But the power of arresting the total satisfaction, he reserved to himself.

Now, when by this pecuniary profits began to increase, and the sale of bulls became profitable, he devised the "golden year," which he wished to celebrate at Rome. This he called a remission of all crimes and punishments. Thither the people flocked; for every one ardently desired to be relieved of his oppressive and intolerable burden. This was finding and bringing to light the treasures of the earth. Immediately the Pope proceeded further, and multiplied golden years, one upon another; but the more money he swallowed, the wider his throat became.

He therefore, afterwards sent out, through the agency of his legates, into all lands, until all churches and houses were filled with golden years. Finally, he rushed into purgatory among the dead also, first by instituting masses and vigils, afterwards with in-

indulgences and golden years; and at last souls became so cheap, that he liberated one for a groat.

Still all this availed nothing. For the Pope, though he taught the people to depend and rely on these indulgences, still rendered it doubtful again; for he asserted in his bulls, that whoever wished to be a partaker of indulgences or golden years, should have attained contrition, made confession, and contributed money. For, as we have already heard, their contrition and confession are doubtful and hypocritical. For no one knew which souls might be in purgatory; and of those in it, no one knew which had repented and confessed correctly. Thus he took the beloved money, and in the mean time consoled them by his power and indulgence, and still referred them again to their uncertain works.

Now, where there were some, who did not conceive themselves guilty of these actual sins in thoughts, words, and actions, as was the case with me and my fellows in monasteries and convents, and with the monks and priests, who, by fasting, prayer, watching, holding of masses, rough clothing, hard couches, &c., strove against evil thoughts, and with earnestness and fervency desired to be holy; still the hereditary, innate evil, sometimes without our being conscious of it, (as St. Augustine, St. Jerome, and others confess,) exercised its nature; yet we contrived to hold, as we taught, that we were so holy,—so void of sin, and full of good works,—that we even imparted and sold to others our superfluous good works, as contributing to their salvation. This is indeed true, and there are seals, letters, and examples to this effect, at hand.

These had no need of repentance. For, why should there be contrition in them, since they did not consent to evil thoughts? What would they confess, since they avoided words? For what purpose would they make satisfaction, since they were innocent of the deed, so that they could even sell their supererogatory righteousness to other poor sinners? The Pharisees and Scribes also in the time of Christ were saints like these.

Here the fiery angel, St. John, appears, who is the true preacher of repentance, and with one word, as with a clap of thunder, prostrates both together, (the buyers and venders of works,) saying: "Repent," Matt. 3, 8. The former think, "we have surely repented," the latter, "we need no repentance." But John says, "Both of you need repentance, for your penitence is false; and *they* are false saints, and both you and they need remission of sins, since neither you nor they yet know what real sin is, much less, that you should have repented and avoided it. Neither you nor they are

good; *you* are full of unbelief, indiscretion, and ignorance concerning God and his will; for here he is present, *of whose fulness we must all receive, and grace for grace*, John 1, 16; and no man can be justified in the sight of God without him. Therefore, if you wish to repent, repent truly; *your* repentance avails nothing. And *you* hypocrites, you who need no repentance, you *generation of vipers, who hath warned you to flee from the wrath to come?*" &c. Matt. 3, 7.

In like manner St. Paul also preaches, Rom. 3, 10, 11, 12, saying: "There is none righteous, no, not one: there is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are altogether become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." And Acts, 17, 30: "But now God commandeth all men every where to repent." All men, says he,—no one excepted, who is human. This repentance enables us to perceive our sins, to perceive that in us, who are all in a state of perdition, there is nothing good, and that we must become new and different persons entirely.

This repentance is not partial and imperfect like that in which actual sins are deplored, nor is it uncertain like that, for it does not dispute which are sins, or which are not sins; but it confounds all together, and says, that in us, all is sinful and intrinsically corrupt. Why should we long seek to make divisions and distinctions? For this reason also the contrition here is not uncertain. For nothing here remains in which we might perceive something good to compensate our sins, but an entire despondency of hope in all that we are, think, say, or do.

In this manner then it is also impossible for the confession to be false, doubtful, or partial. For whoever confesses that all within him is intrinsically sinful, comprehends all sins, excludes none, and forgets none. Thus also the expiation or satisfaction can not be doubtful; for it is not our uncertain, sinful works, but the suffering and blood of the innocent Lamb of God, who bears the sins of the world, that make this satisfaction.

Concerning this repentance John preached, and afterwards Christ in the Gospel, and we also. With this repentance we shall subvert the Pope and all that is based on the good works of men. For all that is called good works or law is built on a rotten, vain foundation, when at the same time there are no good works present, but only evil works. And no one keeps the law, as Christ, John 7, 19, says, but all have transgressed. This fabric is, therefore, nothing but falsehood and hypocrisy, even in its most holy and beautiful features.

And this repentance continues with Christians till death; for it strives with the sins remaining in the flesh during the whole course of life, as Paul, Rom. 7, 23, testifies, that he struggles with the law in his members, &c.; and this he does not by his own strength, but through the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which follow after the remission of sins. These gifts purify and expel the remaining sins daily, and labor to make the person upright, pure, and holy.

Concerning this, neither pope, theologians, jurists, nor any other class of men know any thing from their own reason, but it is a doctrine from heaven, revealed through the Gospel, and must be called heresy by the ungodly.

If, moreover, certain factious persons should rise up, as there may perhaps be some already present, and as at the time of the sedition among the peasants, men came before my own eyes, maintaining that all those who once had received the Spirit or remission of sins, or had obtained faith, if they afterwards committed sins, still however remained in faith, and that such sins do not injure them: and thus exclaiming: "Do whatever you will, it does you no injury, faith exterminates all sins," &c. And who add: "If any one, after having received faith and the Spirit, sins, he did not truly have the Spirit and faith." Many insane persons like these have I seen and heard, and I fear that such a demon still exists in some.

It is, for this reason, necessary to know and to teach that if holy people, who still have and feel hereditary sin, and daily repent of, and strive against it, at some time fall into open sins,—like David who fell into adultery, murder, and blasphemy,—faith and the Holy Spirit were not present at the time. For in the presence of the Holy Spirit sin cannot rule, prevail, or be perpetrated, but is repressed and restrained from accomplishing its purposes. If it, however, accomplishes these purposes, faith and the Holy Spirit are not present at the time; for it is as St. John, 1 John 3, 9, says: "Whosoever is born of God doth not commit sin, and he cannot sin." And yet it is also true, as St. John further writes, "If we say that we have not sinned, we make him a liar, and his word is not in us," 1 John 1, 10.

IV. OF THE GOSPEL.

We shall now return to the Gospel, which affords us more than one means, one counsel and assistance, in opposition to sin; for God is superabundantly rich in his grace and favors:—*First*, through the oral word, in which is preached remission of sins in all the world,

2, 3, 4 } and this is properly the office of the Gospel; *secondly*, through Baptism; *thirdly*, through the holy Sacrament of the Altar; *fourthly*, through the power of the keys, and also through the mutual conference and admonition of brethren, Matt. 18, 20: "Where two or three are gathered," &c.

V. OF BAPTISM.

Baptism is nothing else than the word of God connected with water, commanded by his institution, or as St. Paul says: "A washing of water, by the word," Eph. 5, 26; also as Augustine says: "The word being added to the element, it becomes a sacrament." And for this reason we cannot hold with Thomas and the Dominicans, who forgetting the word and God's institution, say: "God has placed a spiritual power in the water, which washes away sins through the water." Nor can we agree with Scotus and the Franciscans, who teach that Baptism washes away sins through the assistance of the Divine will; thereby asserting that this washing away comes to pass, alone through the will of God, and not at all through the word or water.

Concerning Infant Baptism we hold, that children should be baptized; for they also belong to the promised redemption effected through Christ; and the church should administer it to them.

VI. OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR.

412 } Concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, we hold that the bread and wine in the Eucharist,* are the true body and blood of Christ, which are administered and received not only by pious, but also by impious Christians.

And we hold that more than *one* element should be administered.

* In pursuing this subject, in the twentieth vol. of his works published by Walch, page 1293, sec. 347, 348, 349, Dr. Luther says:—"In the fourth place, the Evangelists write that the Holy Spirit descended upon Christ in the form of a dove in Jordan, John 4, 32; again, that he came upon the disciples in the form of winds and fiery tongues on the day of Pentecost, Acts 2, 2; again, on mount Tabor, in the form of a cloud, Matt. 17, 5. Here Wickliff and the sophists may philosophize and assert that a dove was present, but not the Holy Spirit; or, that the Holy Spirit was there, and not a dove. We say in opposition to both propositions, that if we refer to the dove, we can truly and literally say, 'this is the Holy Spirit,' because, in this case, the two different essences—Spirit and dove—have become one essence in some manner, neither a natural nor personal, but rather a formal union, because the Holy Spirit wished to reveal himself in such form. And in reference to this the Scriptures declare positively, that whoever saw the dove, saw the Holy

And we have no need of the transcendental refinement, which teaches us that there is as much in one element as in both, as the sophists and the Council of Constance teach us. For, even if it were true that there is as much in one element as in both, still the one element is not the whole order and institution established and commanded by Christ. And especially do we condemn, and in the name of God abhor those who, not only omit the second element, but also imperiously forbid, condemn, and calumniate it as heresy, and thus place themselves against and above Christ, our Lord and God.

Concerning transubstantiation, we do by no means regard the subtle sophistry, in which they teach that bread and wine part with, or lose their natural essence, the form and color only remaining, but are no longer real bread and wine; for it corresponds best with the Scripture, that bread is and remains here, as St. Paul himself calls it, "The *bread* which we break," 1 Cor. 10, 16. "And so let him eat of that *bread*," 1 Cor. 11, 28.

VII. OF THE KEYS.

The keys are an office and a power of the church, given by Christ, to bind and to loose sins, not only such as are gross and manifest, but also subtle and secret sins, which God alone perceives; as it is written in the 19th Psalm, verse 12: "Who can understand his errors?" And St. Paul, Rom. 7, 25, complains: "That with the flesh he serves the law of sin." For it does not lie within our power, but in that of God alone, to judge which are sins, and of their enormity and number; as it is written in the 143d Psalm, verse 2: "Enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified." And Paul, 1 Cor. 4, 4, also says: "For I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified."

Spirit, as John 1, 33, says: 'Upon whom thou shalt see the Spirit descending, and remaining on him,' &c.

"Why then should we not much rather say in the Eucharist: *this is my body*, although bread and body are two distinct things, and the word *this* belongs to the bread? For here also has taken place a union of two distinct things: this I shall call a sacramental union, because bread and Christ's body are here given to us for a sacrament. It is not, indeed, a natural or personal union, as in Christ; it is perhaps a different union to that also which the dove has with the Holy Spirit, and the flame with the angel; nevertheless, it is truly a sacramental union.

"For this reason it is correctly said that, if we point to the bread, and say, 'this is the body of Christ,' whoever sees this bread, sees the body of Christ; precisely as John says, that he saw the Holy Spirit, when he saw the dove." &c.—[TRANS.

VIII. OF CONFESSION.

Since absolution or the power of the keys, instituted in the Gospel by Christ, affords comfort and support against sin and an evil conscience, Confession or Absolution shall by no means be abolished in the church, especially on account of weak and timid consciences, and also on account of untutored youth, in order that they may be examined and instructed in the Christian doctrine.

But the enumeration of sins should be free to every one, to enumerate or not to enumerate such as he wishes: for while we are in the flesh, we shall not speak falsely, if we say that we are miserable beings, full of sins. Rom. 7, 23: "I see another law in my members," &c. And since Private Absolution results from the office of the keys, it should not be contemned, but should be highly esteemed, like all other offices of the Christian church.

And in respect to those points, which concern the oral, external word, we should maintain firmly, that God grants his Spirit or grace to no one, unless through or with the external word, previously delivered. Thus we shall fortify ourselves against the enthusiasts, that is, deluded men, who boast of being in possession of the Spirit without and prior to the word, and accordingly judge, explain, and distort the Scripture or the oral word at their pleasure, as Münzer did, and many others still do at the present day, who wish to be acute judges between the Spirit and the letter, but know not what they say or resolve. For Popery is a mere system of enthusiasm, in which the Pope boasts that all rights are in the shrine of *his* heart, and that whatever he judges and commands in his church, must be right and according to the Spirit, even if it is contrary to the Scripture, or the oral word.

All this is the spirit of that ancient Satan, the serpent who made enthusiasts of Adam and Eve, leading them from the external word to spirituality and self-conceit, and did it however also by external words. Precisely as our enthusiasts condemn this external word, and yet they themselves do not keep silence, but fill the world with noisy controversy and contention, as if the Spirit could not come through the Scripture or the oral word of the Apostles, but that through their writing and their words he must come. Why then do they not also omit preaching and writing themselves, till the Spirit himself enters into the people without and prior to their writing, as they boast that he entered into them without the preaching of the Gospel? But we have not time further to discuss this subject here; we have sufficiently urged it in other places.

For those also, who believed prior to their baptism, or who in

their baptism began to believe, have obtained faith through the external word, previously heard; as adults, for instance, must previously have heard that he who believes and is baptized, shall be saved, even if he does not believe at first, and ten years afterwards receives the Spirit and Baptism. Cornelius, Acts 10, had heard long before among the Jews, of the future Messiah, through whom he was justified in the sight of God; and his prayers and alms were accepted in this faith, as Luke calls him just and pious, and not without such previous word or hearing could he believe or be justified. But St. Peter had to reveal unto him that this Messiah, in whom he had hitherto believed as yet to come, had now come, so that his faith concerning the future Messiah might not hold him captive among the obdurate, unbelieving Jews; but that he might know that he must now be saved through the present Messiah, and not, like the Jews, deny or reject him.

In short, enthusiasm implanted and infused with the venom of the old Dragon, has infected and will infect Adam and his posterity, from the beginning of the world to its end; and it is the source of every species of heresy, even the life and power of Popery and Mahometanism. We should and must, therefore, constantly maintain that God will not confer with us frail beings, unless through his external word and sacraments. But all that is boasted of, independent of such word and sacraments, in reference to the Spirit, is criminal. For God desired first to appear to Moses, through a burning bush and the oral word; and no Prophet, neither Elijah nor Elisha, independent of, or without the Ten Commandments, received the Spirit. Neither was John the Baptist conceived without the words of Gabriel preceding; nor did he leap in his mother's womb without the voice of Mary. And St. Peter, 2 Pet. 1, 21, says: "The prophecy came not in old time by the Holy Ghost." But without the external word they were not holy, much less were they, as still unholy, impelled by the Holy Ghost to speak; for they were holy, says Peter, when the Holy Spirit spoke through them.

IX. OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

The *greater excommunication*, as the Pope denominates it, we regard as a mere civil punishment, and it does not pertain to us ministers of the church; but the *less*, that is, the true Christian excommunication, is, not to permit manifest and obstinate sinners to come to the Sacrament, or to other communion of the church, until they

amend their lives and abstain from wickedness. And the preacher should not intermingle civil punishment with this spiritual chastisement or excommunication.

X. OF ORDINATION AND VOCATION.

If the bishops would faithfully discharge their office, and take due care of the church and the Gospel, they might, for the sake of charity and tranquillity, not however from necessity, be allowed the privilege of ordaining and confirming us and our preachers; yet with this condition, that all unchristian masking, mummery, and jugglery should be removed. But since they neither are nor wish to be true bishops, but political lords and princes, who will neither preach nor teach, nor baptize, nor administer the Sacrament, nor transact any work or office in the church, but force, persecute, and condemn those who are called to this office, the church must not on their account remain destitute of ministers.

For this reason, as the ancient examples of the church and of the Fathers teach us, we ourselves should and will ordain suitable persons to this office. And they have no right either to forbid or to prevent us from so doing, even according to their own law; for their laws say that those who are ordained even by heretics, are truly ordained, and that their ordination should not be abrogated. As St. Jerome also writes concerning the church at Alexandria, that it was first ruled in common by bishops, priests, and preachers.

XI. OF THE MARRIAGE OF PRIESTS.

Their prohibition of marriage, and their imposition of perpetual continence on the divine order of priests, they have effected without due cause and authority; and in this they have acted like antichristian, tyrannical, and desperate knaves, and have given cause for horrible, abominable, and incalculable sins of incontinence, in which they still persist. As little as the power is given to us or to them to constitute out of a male a female, or out of a female a male, or to annihilate both, so little had they power to separate or forbid these creatures of God, to live together honorably in a state of matrimony. We shall not therefore consent to their obscene celibacy, or tolerate it; but marriage shall be free, as God has ordained and instituted it, and we will not destroy or impede his work; for St. Paul says *that this is a doctrine of the devil*, 1 Tim. 4, 1-3.

XII. OF THE CHURCH.

We by no means admit that they are the church, for they are not; and we shall likewise not listen to that which they command or forbid in the name of the church. For, praise be to God, a child of seven years old knows what the church is, namely, holy believers, and the lambs who hear the voice of their shepherd. For thus the children pray: "I believe in one holy Christian church." This holiness does not consist in surplices, bald heads, long gowns, and in other ceremonies, devised by themselves, independent of the holy Scriptures; but in the word of God, and in true faith. p-111
" 21

XIII. OF THE MANNER IN WHICH WE ARE JUSTIFIED BEFORE GOD, AND OF GOOD WORKS.

That which I have hitherto and continually taught concerning this subject, I cannot change in the least; namely, that through faith we obtain (as Peter says, Acts 15, 9) another, a new and pure heart, and that God, for the sake of Christ our Mediator, regards and will regard us as entirely just and holy. Although the sins in the flesh are not yet altogether removed or mortified, yet he will not impute them to us, or remember them.

And after this remission of sins, after this faith and renovation, good works follow. And whatever is sinful and imperfect in us, shall not be accounted as sin or imperfection, even for the sake of this same Christ; but we shall, both as to our person and our works, be called and *be* entirely just and holy, through pure grace and mercy in Christ, abundantly poured out and bestowed upon us. For this reason we cannot boast of our merits and our works, if they are viewed apart from grace and mercy; but as it is written, 1 Cor. 1, 31: "He that glorieth, let him glory in the Lord," that is, that he has a gracious God. For thus all is right. We further state also, that if good works do not follow, faith is false and wrong. p-211

XIV. OF MONASTIC VOWS.

Inasmuch as monastic vows operate directly against the first chief article, they should be utterly abolished; for they are the very delusions which caused Christ, Matt. 24, 25, to say: "I am Christ," &c. For whoever commends monastic life, believes that he pursues a better course of life than the common Christian does, and wishes by his works to merit heaven not only for himself, but also for others: this is denying Christ. But they refer to St. Thomas, and boast that monastic vows are equal to Baptism: this is a blasphemy against God.

XV. OF HUMAN ORDINANCES.

The assertion of the Papists, that human ordinances contribute to remission of sins, or merit salvation, is unchristian and condemned, as Christ, Matt. 15, 9, says: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," and Tit. 1, 14, "that turn from the truth." Again, their assertion, that it is a mortal sin to break such ordinances, is also incorrect.

These are the articles, upon which, through the will of God, I *must* stand, and *will* stand, till my death. And I know nothing in them to alter or to concede. But if any one will concede any thing, he does it at the peril of his own conscience.

Finally, the juggling tricks of the Pope still remain, in reference to foolish and puerile articles; as, concerning the consecration of churches, the baptism of bells and altars, and appointing those who contribute to these things, as sponsors upon the occasion. This baptism, which should not be tolerated, is a contumely and a derision of holy Baptism.

Further, we shall keep ourselves entirely aloof from the consecration of tapers, palms, cakes, oats, spices, &c., which, however, cannot be called consecration, but a mere mockery and deception; such delusive performances we commit to the Pope, which his adherents may adore till they are weary, but we will have nothing to do with such things.

Dr. M. Luther, subscribed.

Dr. Justus Jonas, the Rector, subscribed with his own hand.

Dr. John Bugenhagen of Pomerania, subscribed.

Dr. Caspar Cruciger, subscribed.

Nicholas Amsdorf of Magdeburg, subscribed.

George Spalatin of Aldenburg, subscribed.

I, Philip Melancthon, approve the foregoing Articles as pious and Christian. But in regard to the Pope I hold, that if he would receive the Gospel, we might also allow him by human authority (*jure humano*), and for the sake of peace and the common concord of Christendom, to exercise jurisdiction over the bishops who are now or may hereafter be under his authority.

John Agricola of Eisleben, subscribed.

Gabriel Dydimus, subscribed.

I, Dr. Urban Regius, superintendent of the churches in the dukedom of Luneburg, subscribe in my own name and in the names of my brothers, and of the church of Hanover.

I, Stephen Agricola, minister at Chur, subscribe.

- I, John Draconites, professor and minister at Marburg, subscribe.
- I, Conrad Feigenbotz, for the glory of God here testify that I have thus believed, and still continue so to believe and teach.
- I, Andrew Osiander, minister at Nuremberg, subscribe.
- I, M. Vitus Dietrich, minister at Naumburg, subscribe.
- I, Edward Schnepf, preacher at Stuttgart, subscribe.
- Conrad Otinger, preacher of duke Ulric at Pfortzheim.
- Simon Schneweis, steward of the church in Crailsheim.
- I, John Schlaginhauffen, pastor of the church at Kötten, subscribe.
- George Heltus of Forcheim, A. M.
- Adam of Fulda, A. M. { Preachers in Hesse.
- Anthony Corvinus, A. M. {
- I, Dr. John Bugenhagen of Pomerania, again subscribe in the name of John Brentius, A. M., as on leaving Sinalcald, he directed me verbally and in writing, which I have shown to these brethren who have subscribed.
- I, Dionysius Melander subscribe to the Confession, the Apology, and the Agreement on the subject of the Sacrament.
- Paul Rhodius, superintendent of Stettin.
- Gerard Oeniken, superintendent of the church in Minden.
- I, Briccus of Northan, minister of the church of Christ which is at Soest, subscribe to the Articles of the Rev. father, M. Luther, and confess that I have thus believed and taught, and, by the Spirit of Christ, will continue thus to believe and to teach.
- Michael Coelius, minister at Mansfeld, subscribed.
- Peter Geltner, A. M., minister at Frankfort, subscribed.
- Wendal Faber, steward at Seburg in the duchy of Mansfeld.
- I, John Aepinus, subscribe.
- I, John Amsterdam of Bremen, subscribe.
- I, Frederic Myconius of Gotha, pastor of the church of Thuringia, subscribe in my name and in that of Justus Menius of Isenach.
- I, Dr. John Long, minister of the church at Erfurt, subscribe in my own name and in that of my coadjutors in the Gospel, namely:
- The licentiate L. Platzis, of Melosing.
- Rev. Sigismund Kirchner.
- “ Wolfgang Kismetter.
- “ Melchior Weitman.
- “ John Tall.
- “ John Kilian.
- “ Nicholas Faber.
- “ Andrew Menser,—I subscribe with my own hand.
- I, Egidius Mechler, have subscribed with my own hand.

APPENDIX TO THE SMALCALD ARTICLES,

WRITTEN BY

THE THEOLOGIANS ASSEMBLED AT SMALCALD,

A. D. 1537.

— 17 —

OF THE POWER AND PRIMACY OF THE POPE.

First, the Pope arrogates to himself, that he is, according to divine right, supreme over all other bishops and pastors in the whole Christian world.

Secondly, he adds that, according to divine right, he has *both* swords, that is, he has authority to enthrone and dethrone kings, to regulate civil kingdoms, &c.

Thirdly, he says that we are under obligation to believe this, at the hazard of everlasting salvation. And these are the reasons for which the Pope calls and presumes himself to be the vicar of Christ on earth.

These three articles, we hold and know to be false, impious, tyrannical, and pernicious in the extreme, to the Christian church. In order, then, that our position and views may be more clearly understood, we shall first show what his assumption is, in which he boasts that he is supreme according to divine right. For they thus understand that the Pope is the common bishop of the universal Christian church, and that he is *Oecumenicus Episcopus*, as they call it, that is, the one by whom all bishops throughout the world should be ordained and confirmed, and that he alone has authority to choose, to ordain, to confirm, and to depose all bishops and pastors.

He moreover assumes to himself authority to enact various laws concerning divine services, the alteration of sacraments and doctrine, desiring us to regard his statutes and ordinances as equal to articles of Christian faith and to the holy Scripture, and as not to be neglected without sin. For he wishes to base this power on divine right and the holy Scripture; yea, he wishes us to prefer it to the holy Scriptures and commandments of God; and what is still more atrocious, he adds further, that all this shall and must be believed at the hazard of everlasting salvation.

We shall therefore, in the first place, show from the holy Gospel, that the Pope can assume no authority at all over other bishops and pastors, according to divine right.

I.—Luke 22, 24, 25, 26, Christ forbids, in clear and express terms, one Apostle to have any authority over the others; for even this was the inquiry among the disciples, when Christ had spoken relative to his sufferings: they disputed among themselves who should be lord among them, and future vicar of Christ, after his death. But Christ rebuked this error of the Apostles, and taught them that there should be no authority and superiority among them, but that they should be apostles alike, and preach the Gospel as equal in office. For this reason he also says: “The kings of the Gentiles exercise lordship over them; and they that exercise authority upon them are called benefactors. But ye shall not be so: but he that is greatest among you, let him be as the younger; and he that is chief, as he that doth serve.” Hence it appears, on examination, that he desired no lordship among the Apostles.

II.—This also clearly appears from the similitude, Matt. 18, 2, in which Christ, on a similar disputation concerning dominion, set a little child in the midst of the Apostles, for the purpose of showing, that, as a child neither desires nor assumes any dominion, so also the Apostles and all who should preach the Word, should neither seek nor use authority.

III.—John 20, 21, Christ sent his disciples *alike* to the office of the ministry, without any distinction, that one should have either more or less power than another. For thus he says: “As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you.” These words are clear and explicit, that he so sent each one, as he was sent. Here, indeed, no one can assume a special prerogative or power in preference to and above the others.

IV.—Gal. 2, 7, 8, the holy apostle Paul testifies clearly, that he was neither ordained, nor confirmed, nor established by Peter; nor does he in any way acknowledge Peter as necessary to confirm him; and especially does he strive against the idea that his call is dependent, or based on the power of St. Peter, in any respect. Now he should indeed have acknowledged Peter as a superior, if Peter had ever received such primacy from Christ, as the Pope without any grounds presumes. For this reason Paul also says, that he freely preached the Gospel a long time before he consulted with Peter and the other Apostles about it. Again, he says: “But of those who seemed to be somewhat, whatsoever they were, it maketh no matter to me; God accepteth no man’s person: for they who seemed to be somewhat, in conference added nothing to me,” Gal. 2, 6. Since, then, Paul clearly testifies that he did not solicit Peter to license him to preach, even when he at last came to him, we are clearly

taught that the office of the ministry originates from the common call of the Apostles, and that it is not necessary for all to have a call and confirmation from this one person, Peter.

V.—1 Cor. 3, 5, 6, 7, Paul equalizes all the ministers of the church, and teaches that the church is greater than its servants. For this reason no one can assert with truth, that Peter had any primacy or power superior to other apostles, or over the church and all other ministers. For thus he says: "All things are yours: whether Paul, or Apollos, or Cephas," 1 Cor. 3, 21, 22; that is, neither Peter, nor other ministers of the Word, have a right to assume to themselves power or superiority over the church. No one shall encumber the church with his own ordinances, and no one's power or reputation shall avail more than the Word of God. We dare not extol the power of Cephas higher than that of the other Apostles, as though they were accustomed to argue at that time, saying, Cephas observes it, who is the chief Apostle, therefore Paul and others must thus observe it also. No, says Paul, and refutes the pretence, that Peter's reputation and authority should be superior to that of the other Apostles, or of the church.

From History.

VI.—The Council of Nice resolved, that the bishop at Alexandria should provide for the churches in the east, and the bishop at Rome, for those which belonged to the provinces of Rome in the west. Here the Roman bishop's power first increased, not by divine, but by human law, by this resolution of the Council of Nice. Now, if the Roman bishop was the highest, according to divine right, the Council of Nice had no right to divest him of this power, and to confer it upon the bishop of Alexandria. Yea, all the bishops in the east should have perpetually desired the bishop of Rome to ordain and confirm them.

VII.—Again, it was resolved by the Council of Nice, that each church should choose for itself a bishop in the presence of one or more bishops, living in the vicinity. This practice was observed for a long time, not only in the east, but also in the west, and in the Latin churches, as is clearly expressed in the writings of Cyprian and Augustine. For thus says Cyprian in *Epist. 4, ad Cornelium*: "For this reason, we should diligently hold, according to the command of God and the usage of the Apostles, as is also observed among us, and in nearly all countries, that, in order to the proper performance of ordinations, the bishops living in the nearest province, should assemble in the congregation for which a bishop is to be cho-

sen, and in the presence of the whole congregation, who know the walk and conduct of each one, the bishop shall be chosen; as we see was done in the election of Sabinus, our colleague, who according to the vote of the whole congregation and the counsel of the bishops present, was elected to the office of bishop, and hands laid on him," &c.

This mode Cyprian calls a divine mode and an Apostolic usage, and he affirms that it was thus observed in nearly all countries at that time.

Inasmuch, then, as neither *ordination* nor *confirmation* was at that time sought from the bishop at Rome, in a great portion of the world, in all the churches of the Greeks and Latins, it is clear that the church did not at that time attribute such superiority and dominion to the bishop at Rome.

Such superiority and dominion are wholly and utterly impossible. For how could it be possible that one bishop should provide for all churches in the whole circle of Christianity, or that the churches, situated far from Rome, could have all their ministers ordained by one alone?

For, it is indeed evident that the kingdom of Christ is dispersed throughout the world; and there are also still at the present day many Christian churches in the east, who are in possession of ministers neither ordained nor confirmed by the Pope or his adherents. Now, since such superiority, as the Pope has arrogated to himself contrary to all Scripture, is wholly and utterly impossible, and since the churches in a great part of the world, have neither acknowledged nor employed the Pope as their lord, it is clearly perceived that this superiority was not instituted by Christ, and that it does not proceed from divine right.

VIII.—In former times there were many councils summoned and held, in which the bishop of Rome did not preside as the highest; as for instance, that of Nice, and those of other places besides. This is also an evidence that the churches at that time did not acknowledge the Pope as supreme lord over all churches and bishops.

IX.—St. Jerome says: "If any one wishes to speak of power and dominion, *orbis* is more than *urbs*, that is, the *world* is more than the *city Rome*. Therefore, be it the bishop of Rome, or of Eugubium, of Constantinople, or Rhegium, or Alexandria, the dignity and office are equal," &c.

X.—Again, Gregory writes to the Patriarch of Alexandria, and forbids himself to be called the highest bishop. And in the *Registers* he says: "In the Council of Chalcedon it was offered to the bishop

at Rome, that he should be the highest bishop, but he did not accept it."

XI.—Finally, how can the Pope have authority over the whole church according to divine right, since the church still possesses the right of election, and since it gradually became the custom for the Roman bishops to be confirmed by the emperors?

Here certain passages are produced in opposition to us; as, Matt. 16, 18, 19: "Thou art Peter, and upon this rock I will build my church;" again, "I will give unto thee the keys;" again, "Feed my sheep," John 21, 15, 16, 17. But inasmuch as an account of this whole controversy has already been given by our friends, both copious and accurate, we wish those writings to be consulted, and we shall at present mention briefly how these passages just mentioned are properly to be understood.

In all these passages Peter represents not only himself, but all the Apostles, and speaks not merely for himself. This fact the texts clearly prove. For Christ asks not Peter alone, but says: "Whom say ye that I am?" Matt. 16, 15. And that which Christ here says to Peter alone,—namely, "I will give unto thee the keys," verse 19; again, "Whatsoever thou shalt bind," &c.,—in other places he says to all of them together: "Whatsoever ye shall bind on earth," &c., Matt. 18, 18; again, John 20, 23: "Whosoever sins ye remit," &c. These words prove that the keys were given to all in common, and that they were all alike sent to preach.

And this, moreover, must be confessed, that the keys belong and were given not to one person only, but to the whole church, as it can be sufficiently proved by clear and incontestable reasons. For precisely as the promise of the Gospel pertains, without limitation, to the whole church, so the keys pertain to the whole church, without limitation, since the keys are nothing else but the office through which this promise is imparted to every one that desires it; it is evident, then, that the church, in effect, has power to ordain ministers. And Christ, Matt. 18, 18, with these words—"Whatsoever ye shall bind" &c.—declares and specifies to whom he gave the keys; namely, to the church: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name," &c. verse 20. Again verse 17, Christ refers the highest and last judgment to the church, where he says: "Tell it unto the church."

From this, then, it follows, that in these passages not only Peter, but all the Apostles together, are meant. Therefore, no one from these passages can by any means derive a special power of supremacy, which Peter held in preference to the other Apostles, or which he

should have held. But it is written: "And upon this rock I will build my church." Here it must be confessed, that the church is not built upon the power of any man, but it is built upon that office which bears the confession made by Peter, namely, that *Jesus is the Christ, the Son of the living God*, Matt. 16, 16; for this reason Christ also speaks unto him as a minister of this office, in which this confession and doctrine should exist; and he says: *Upon this rock*, that is, upon this doctrine and ministerial office.

Now, truly this office of the ministry is not confined to any particular place or person, as the Levitical office under the law was; but it is dispersed throughout the world, and it is wherever God has bestowed his gifts, and sent his apostles, prophets, pastors, teachers, &c. Nor does the authority of any person add any thing to this word and office, ordained by Christ, preach and teach it who will; where there are hearts who believe it and adhere to it, to these it comes as they hear and believe it. In this manner many ancient teachers explain these passages, not concerning the person of Peter, but concerning Peter's office and confession; as for instance, Origen, Ambrose, Cyprian, Hilarius, and Beda.

Nor does it follow from these declarations in other places—"Feed my sheep;" again, "Peter, lovest thou me more than these?" John 21, 15,—that Peter should have more power than other apostles, but he bids him, *feed*, that is, preach the Gospel, or rule the church through the Gospel—this pertains even as well to other apostles as to Peter.

The second article is more perspicuous still than the first. For Christ gave his disciples only spiritual power; that is, he commanded them to preach the Gospel, to announce the remission of sins, to administer the sacraments, and to excommunicate the ungodly without temporal power, through the Word; and he did by no means command them to bear the sword, or to constitute a political government, to capture, to enthrone kings, or to dethrone them. For thus says Christ: "Go ye and teach all nations, teaching them to observe all things whatsoever I have commanded you," Matt. 28, 19, 20; again, John 20, 21: "As my Father hath sent me, even so send I you."

Now, it is evident that Christ was not sent to bear the sword, or to rule in a civil capacity, as he says himself: "My kingdom is not of this world," John 18, 36. And Paul says: "Not for that we have dominion over your faith," 2 Cor. 1, 24. Again, "The weapons of our warfare are not carnal," &c. 2 Cor. 10, 4. Christ's being crowned with thorns, in his passion, presented in a purple robe, and his being thus mocked, were all a signification that in the course

of time, the true spiritual kingdom of Christ should be scorned, and his Gospel suppressed, and another external kingdom, instituted instead of it, under the appearance of spiritual power. Therefore the *Constitution of Boniface VIII., Chap. Omnes, Distinct. 22*, and the like passages, are wholly and entirely false and impious, in which they wish to maintain, that the Pope by virtue of divine right is lord over all the kingdoms of the earth. From which persuasion deplorable darkness was first brought into the church, and afterwards distressing tumults and commotions arose in Europe. For thus the office of the ministry was neglected, and the doctrine concerning faith and the spiritual kingdom of Christ, was entirely suppressed, and the external polity and ordinances of the Pope, were regarded as Christian righteousness.

Finally, the Popes proceeded to seize upon principalities and kingdoms, enthroned and dethroned kings, and with unjust excommunication and wars they tormented nearly all the kings in Europe, but especially the German emperors; sometimes by taking into their possession the cities of Italy, sometimes by bringing into subjection to themselves the bishops in Germany, and assuming the bestowal of bishoprics which belonged to the emperor alone. Yea, it is even asserted in the writings of Clement V.: "When an empire becomes vacant, the Pope is the legitimate successor."

Thus the Pope has not only unjustly taken civil dominion to himself, contrary to the clear commands of God, but, like a tyrant, desired to be superior to all kings. Although these acts of the Popes are wholly and entirely culpable in themselves, this is more atrocious still, that they cover this wantonness and violence, with the command of Christ, and construe the keys to mean political dominion, and base the salvation of souls upon this impious and infamous opinion which they maintain: "The people shall, at the hazard of the salvation of their souls, believe that the Pope has such authority by divine right."

Now, since these abominable errors have entirely obscured the doctrine concerning faith and the kingdom of Christ, there is no ground upon which we dare remain silent in reference to them; for we see with our own eyes what great injuries have resulted to the church from them.

In the third place, it is likewise necessary to know, that even if the Pope had this power and primacy from divine right, we are under no obligation to be obedient to those Popes who defend a false worship, idolatry, and erroneous doctrines, repugnant to the Gospel.

Yea, still further, we should hold these Popes and this kingdom as an *anathema*, as Paul distinctly says: "Though we, or an angel from heaven, preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed," Gal. 1, 8. And in the Acts, 5, 29, it is said: "We ought to obey God rather than men." For the ecclesiastical laws themselves say: "No one shall be obedient to a Pope who is a heretic."

In the law of Moses the high-priests had their office from divine right; no one, however, was bound to yield obedience to them, if they acted contrary to the Word of God; for we see that Jeremiah and other prophets separated themselves from the priests. So the Apostles separated themselves from Caiaphas; and they were under no obligation to render obedience to him. Now, it is evident that the Popes with their accomplices defend and sustain impious doctrines and erroneous worship. So also do all impious acts, which are foretold in the holy Scriptures concerning Antichrist, accord with the kingdom of the Pope and his members. For Paul, where he describes Antichrist, 2 Thess. 2, 4, denominates him an adversary of Christ, *who opposeth and exalteth himself above all that is called God, or that is worshipped; so that he, as God, sitteth in the temple of God, showing that he is God*. In this passage Paul speaks concerning one who reigns in the church, and not concerning heathen kings; calling him an adversary of Christ, because he devises a different doctrine, and because he assumes all this, as if he did it by divine right.

First, it is plain that the Pope rules in the church, and has appropriated this dominion to himself, under the pretext of spiritual power; for he bases himself upon these words: "I will give unto thee the keys of the kingdom of heaven," Matt. 16, 19.

Secondly, the doctrine of the Pope is indeed in every way repugnant to the Gospel.

Thirdly, there are three ways in which he claims to be God:

First, because he assumes to himself the authority to alter the doctrines of Christ and the true worship, instituted of God himself, and desires to have his own doctrine and self-devised services to God observed, as if God had commanded them himself.

Secondly, because he assumes the power to bind and to loose, not only in this present life, but also in the life to come.

Thirdly, because the Pope will not permit the church, or any one else, to judge him, but desires that his authority shall be preferred to all councils and to the whole church; but this is making himself God, if he will not allow the judgment either of the church or of any one else.

Finally, the Pope has defended these errors and this impious system, by the exercise of unjust power and by murder, causing all those who did not hold with him in every respect, to be put to death.

Inasmuch, then, as these things are so, all Christians should be fully on their guard, lest they make themselves partakers of this impious doctrine, blasphemy, and unjust cruelty; and should withdraw from the Pope and his members or accomplices, as from the kingdom of Antichrist, and execrate it, as Christ has commanded: "Beware of false prophets," Matt. 7, 15. And Paul, Tit. 3, 10, commands: "A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject." And 2 Cor. 6, 14, he says: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?" &c. It is grievous, indeed, for a person to separate himself from so many countries and people, and to maintain this doctrine: but here stands the command of God, that each one should be on his guard, and not be an accomplice with those who promulgate false doctrines, or defend them with cruelty.

Our consciences are, therefore, sufficiently exculpated and secured; for we truly see before our eyes, the enormous errors which prevail in the kingdom of the Pope. And the Scripture proclaims, in the most forcible manner, that these errors are the doctrines of the devil and of Antichrist. The idolatry in the abuse of the mass, is evident, which mass, besides its other evil tendencies, is misused for unjust profit and mercenary purposes. The doctrine of repentance has been utterly falsified and destroyed by the Pope and his adherents. For thus they teach: "Sins are forgiven for the sake of our own works;" and they add, that it should be doubted however whether sins are forgiven. And they nowhere teach that sins are forgiven for the sake of Christ, without our merit, and that this forgiveness of sins is obtained through faith in Christ.

By this doctrine they deprive Christ of his honor, rob the conscience of its true and sure consolation, and abolish the truly divine services, namely, the exercise of faith, which struggles with unbelief and with loss of confidence in the promises of the Gospel.

They have in like manner obscured the doctrine concerning sin, and devised their own ordinances concerning the obligation to enumerate and confess all sins; from which have resulted diverse errors, and at last utter despondency.

Afterwards they invented self-devised expiations, by which the benefits and merits of Christ would be superseded.

Hence have resulted indulgences, which are nothing but falsehoods devised for the sake of money alone.

What innumerable abuses and abominable idolatry afterwards followed from the invocation of saints!

What infamy and vice have originated from the prohibition of marriage!

How was the Gospel beclouded by the doctrine concerning vows! Here it was taught, that such vows constitute righteousness before God, and merit remission of sins; so that the merit of Christ is transferred to the ordinances of men, and the doctrine concerning faith is wholly obliterated.

And they have extolled their foolish and frivolous ordinances as true services to God and as perfection, and preferred them to the works which God has ordered and which he requires from each one in his vocation. We dare not, then, regard these as trivial errors; for they deprive Christ of his honor, and destroy souls: we should, therefore, not permit them to pass uncensured.

To these errors are added two enormous and abominable sins. The *one* is, that the Pope desires to defend and maintain these errors with unjust fury, with cruel tyranny and violence; the *other* is, that he divests the church of her judgment, and will not allow these religious affairs to be judged in an orderly manner. Yea, he wishes to be above all councils, and to have power to dissolve and rescind all that is resolved in councils, as the canons sometimes impudently pretend; and the Popes have done these things still more impudently, as many examples show.

9. *Questione 3*, the canon says: "No one shall judge the primacy; for neither emperors nor priests, neither kings nor people, judge the judge."

Thus the Pope acts as a tyrant in both positions, by defending these errors with violence and outrage, and by not allowing any judge. And this latter point is the source of more injury than all his other outrages. For as soon as the churches are deprived of the power to judge and to make a decision, there can be no possible means by which false doctrines or unjust methods of worship can be checked, in consequence of which many souls must be lost.

Pious persons should, for this reason, seriously reflect upon these abominable errors of the Pope and his tyranny; and they should know in the first place, that these errors must be avoided, and the true doctrine embraced, for the sake of God's honor and the salvation of souls. Finally, they should consider how great and abominable a sin it is to assist in promoting this unjust cruelty of the Pope, by which so many pious Christians are so miserably slaughtered, whose blood, undoubtedly, God will not leave unavenged.

But especially should kings and princes, as the principal members of the church, employ their influence in abolishing all errors, and in having the conscience correctly instructed; as God has admonished kings and princes to this duty particularly in the second Psalm and tenth verse: "Be wise now, therefore, O ye kings; be instructed ye judges of the earth." For this should be the chief concern among kings and illustrious rulers, diligently to advance the glory of God.

For this reason it would be unjust indeed, if they would apply their power and authority to the confirmation of this abominable idolatry and other incalculable vices, and to the cruel murder of pious Christians.

And if the Pope should even hold a council, how can the condition of the church be improved, if the Pope will not allow any thing to be resolved against him; or if he will permit no one else, but those who are bound to him previously by the obligation of a terrible oath,—not even excepting the Word of God,—to judge in church affairs?

But inasmuch as the judgments in councils, are the judgments of the church, and not of the Pope, it will be incumbent on kings and princes not to grant the Pope this privilege, but to use their endeavors to prevent the church from being deprived of the power to judge, and to cause all things to be decided according to the holy Scripture and word of God. And just as Christians are under obligation to censure all the errors of the Pope, so they are also under obligation to reprehend the Pope himself, if he wishes to evade or resist the right judgment and true decision of the church.

Wherefore, even if the Pope derived his primacy or supremacy from divine right, we still ought not to render obedience to him, while he wishes to defend false methods of worship, and a doctrine contrary to the Gospel: yea, necessity requires us to oppose him as the real Antichrist. We see clearly what the errors of the Pope are, and how great they are.

The cruelty which he exercises against pious Christians, is also well known. And here stand the word and command of God, that we should avoid idolatry, false doctrine, and cruelty. Therefore, every pious Christian has weighty, necessary, and clear reasons enough not to render obedience to the Pope. And these weighty reasons afford great consolation to all Christians, against all the reproach and scandal which our adversaries heap upon us, asserting that we give offence and excite schisms and disunion.

But those who hold with the Pope, and defend his doctrine and false worship, stain themselves with idolatry and blasphemous doctrine, and load themselves with all the blood of pious Christians, whom the Pope and his adherents persecute; and they also impair the

honor of God and the salvation of the church, because they confirm these errors and vices before all the world, to the injury of all posterity.

OF THE POWER AND JURISDICTION OF BISHOPS.

In our Confession and Apology, we have stated in general what is necessary to be said in reference to ecclesiastical power. For the Gospel commands those who should regulate the church, to preach the Gospel, to remit sins, and to administer the sacraments; and it, moreover, gives them the authority to excommunicate those who live in the open commission of sin, and to absolve those who desire to amend their lives.

Now, every one, even our adversaries, must confess that all who preside over the church, have this command alike, whether they be called pastors, or presbyters, or bishops. Therefore Jerome declares in distinct terms, that bishops and presbyters are not different, but that all clergymen are alike bishops and priests; and he produces the declaration of Paul to Titus, 1, 5, 6, in which he says: "For this cause left I thee at Crete, that thou shouldest set in order the things that are wanting, and ordain elders in every city;" and afterwards he calls these *bishops*: "A bishop then must be blameless, the husband of one wife," 1 Tim. 3, 2. So Peter and John call themselves presbyters or priests.

Afterwards Jerome further declares: "The practice of choosing one who should be placed over the others, was introduced that schisms might be prevented, that one might not draw a church to himself here, and another there, and thus separate the church. For at Alexandria," says he, "from Mark the Evangelist, to Heraclas and Dionysius, the presbyters have always elected one from among themselves, esteemed him more highly, and called him *Episcopus* (bishop), precisely as the military elect a captain; and as the deacons elected one from among themselves, who was qualified for the duties, whom they called Archdeacon. For, tell me, what more does a bishop perform, than a presbyter, except to ordain others to ecclesiastical office," &c.

Jerome here teaches, that this difference between bishops and pastors originated from human regulations alone, as we actually observe in practice. For the office and the authority are entirely the same; but in subsequent time, the mode of ordination alone made the distinction between bishops and pastors. For it was afterwards thus determined, that a bishop should ordain persons to the duties of the ministry in other churches also.

But as, according to divine authority, there is no difference between bishops and pastors, or ministers, there is no doubt that, if a pastor ordain qualified persons in his church to church-offices, such ordination is valid and right, according to divine authority.

For this reason, while the bishops generally still violate the Gospel, and refuse to ordain qualified persons, every church has in this case legal authority to ordain ministers for itself.

For wherever the church is, there indeed is the command to preach the Gospel. Therefore, the churches undoubtedly retain the authority to call, to elect, and ordain ministers. And this authority is a privilege which God has given especially to the church, and it cannot be taken away from the church, by any human power, as Paul testifies, Eph. 4, 8, 11, 12, where he says: "When he ascended up on high, he led captivity captive, and gave gifts unto men." And among these gifts, which belong to the church, he enumerates *pastors and teachers*, and adds that these were given *for the edifying of the body of Christ*. Wherefore, it follows that wherever there is a true church, there is also the power to elect and ordain ministers. In case of necessity a mere layman may absolve another, and become his pastor; as St. Augustine relates that two Christians were in a ship together, the one baptized the other, and afterwards was absolved by him.

To this point the declarations of Christ pertain, which show that the keys are given to the whole church, and not merely to some particular persons; as the text says: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," Matt. 18, 20.

Finally, this is also confirmed by the declaration of Peter, where he says: "Ye are a royal priesthood," 1 Pet. 2, 9. These words relate specifically to the true church, which, because it alone possesses a priesthood, must also have power to choose and ordain ministers.

The common usages of the church likewise prove this: for in former times the people elected clergymen and bishops; then the bishop, living in or near the same place, came and confirmed those elected, by the laying on of hands; and, at that time, ordination was nothing else than this approbation.

Afterwards other ceremonies were added. Dionysius relates some of them; but this book of Dionysius is a modern fiction under a false title, like the book of Clement, which also has a false title, and was written long after the time of Clement by a wicked impostor.

And finally it was also added, that the bishop said to those

whom he consecrated: "I give you power to sacrifice for the living and the dead;" but this also does not occur in Dionysius.

Hence we see that the church has power to choose and ordain ministers. Therefore, if the bishops are either heretics, or will not ordain qualified persons, the churches are under obligation in the sight of God, according to the divine law, to ordain for themselves pastors and other church-officers.

And if any one call this disorder or separation, he should know that the impious doctrine and tyranny of the bishops, are in fault of it; for Paul commands that all bishops, who either teach incorrectly themselves, or defend incorrect doctrines and false worship, should be deemed offenders.

Hitherto we have been speaking concerning *ordination*, which alone has made a difference between bishops and priests, as Jerome says. It is, therefore, unnecessary to dispute much about the other episcopal offices, unless we should wish to speak concerning unction, the baptizing of bells, and other similar impositions, which are almost the only things that the bishops exclusively practice; but it is necessary to treat of *jurisdiction*.

This is certain, that clergymen generally should have the right to excommunicate those who live in open immorality, and that the bishops as tyrants have arrogated it to themselves, and exercised it for their own profit. For these men have carried on intolerable abuses with it, and either through avarice or wantonness, persecuted and excommunicated people without any legal investigation. What a tyranny is this! a bishop to have power, according to his own caprice, without the forms of justice, thus to agitate and afflict the people with excommunications, &c.!

But they have employed this penalty in diverse offences, and have not only protected the real offender from it, against whom excommunication should have been pronounced, but have inflicted punishment on other small offences,—such as not fasting and observing holidays correctly. They have, indeed, sometimes punished adultery, but they have also frequently disgraced and defamed innocent persons. For as such an accusation is very serious, no one should be condemned without trial in legal and due form.

Now, since the bishops have arrogated this jurisdiction to themselves, and most shamefully abused it, these are good reasons why we should refuse them obedience. And it is right to take away from them this usurped jurisdiction, and restore it to the pastors to whom it belongs according to the command of Christ, and to have

it exercised legitimately for the improvement of morals, the amendment of life, and the increase of God's glory.

There is, moreover, a jurisdiction in such matters as, according to Papal institutions, pertain to the ecclesiastical court; especially affairs concerning matrimony. This jurisdiction the bishops have also arrogated to themselves by human authority alone, which however is not very ancient, as may be perceived from the Code and Novels of Justinian, that matters relating to marriage were at that time transacted entirely by civil government; and civil government is under obligation to determine these matters, especially if the bishops decide unjustly, or become negligent, as the canons also show.

Wherefore, we are under no obligation to render obedience to the bishops in reference to this jurisdiction. And since they have instituted several unjust ordinances concerning matrimonial affairs, and enforce them in the courts over which they preside, the civil magistrate is, for this reason also, bound to reform these courts.

For, the prohibition of marriage between sponsors is unjust; and it is also unjust, when, if two persons are divorced, the innocent party is not allowed to marry again. Moreover, it is an unjust law, which in general approves all marriages that take place secretly and deceitfully, without the previous knowledge and consent of the parents. And the prohibition of the marriage of priests, is also unjust.

Besides these, there are other points in their ordinances, by which men's consciences have been confused and burthened, and which it is unnecessary to relate here; it is sufficient to say, that many unjust and improper things have been commanded by the Pope, on account of which the civil authority has sufficient cause to constitute a different jurisdiction in these matters.

Now, since the bishops, who are devoted to the Pope, violently defend impious doctrines and a false worship, and will not ordain pious preachers, but assist the Pope in murdering them, and have, moreover, divested the pastors of their jurisdiction, and have exercised it as tyrants, for their own emolument alone; and finally, since they have also treated affairs relative to matrimony so unjustly, the churches have great and sufficient reasons for not acknowledging them as bishops. But bishops should consider that their property and income are furnished as alms, that they might serve the churches, and the better execute their office, as the rule says: "The benefice is bestowed for the rendering of service." Therefore, they cannot with clear conscience use such alms otherwise, and thus rob the churches which need such goods for the support of their ministers, for rearing learned persons, for the maintenance of the poor, and especi-

ally for the constitution of a *matrimonial judiciary*; for cases peculiar frequently occur, for which it is necessary to have a peculiar judiciary. But this cannot be sustained without the help of these goods. St. Peter predicted that false bishops would use the possessions and alms of the church to gratify their own sensuality, and forsake the proper duties of their office, 2 Pet. 2, 13. And since the Holy Ghost threatens them thus severely, the bishops should know that they must render an account unto God for such robbery.

THE DOCTORS AND MINISTERS WHO SUBSCRIBED TO THE AUGSBURG
CONFESSION AND THE APOLOGY, A. D. 1537.

In conformity with the Mandate of the illustrious princes, orders, and estates, professing the doctrine of the Gospel, we have read the articles of the Confession, exhibited to the Emperor in the assembly at Augsburg, and by the kindness of God, all the ministers who were present in the assembly at Smalcald, unanimously profess that they believe, and teach in their several churches, agreeably to the articles of the Confession and the Apology. They acknowledge also that they approve the Article concerning the Power and Primacy of the Pope, and concerning the Power and Jurisdiction of the Bishops, which article was exhibited to the princes in the assembly here at Smalcald. Accordingly they have subscribed their names.

I, Dr. John Bugenhagen, subscribe to the Articles of the Augsburg Confession, to the Apology, and to the Article concerning the Papacy, submitted to the princes at Smalcald.

And I, Dr. Urban Regius, superintendent of the churches in the dukedom of Luneburg, subscribe.

Nicholas Amsdorf of Magdeburg, subscribed.

George Spalatin of Aldenburg, subscribed.

I, Andrew Osiander, subscribe.

M. Vitus Dietrich of Naumburg, subscribed.

Stephen Agricola, minister at Chur, subscribed with his own hand.

John Draconites of Marburg, subscribed.

Conrad Feigenbotz subscribed unreservedly.

Martin Bucer.

I, Edward Schnepf, subscribe.

Paul Rhodius, minister in Stettin.

Gerard Oeniken, minister of the church in Minden.

Simon Schneewis, steward of Crailsheim.

Briceius of Northan, minister at Soest.

I, Pomeranus, again subscribe in the name of Mr. John Brentius, as he has instructed me.

Philip Melanchthon subscribed with his own hand.

Anthony Corvinus subscribed with his own hand, for himself and for Adam of Fulda.

John Schlaginhauffen subscribed with his own hand.

Mr. George Heltus of Forcheim.

Michael Coelius, minister at Mansfeld.

Peter Geltner, minister of the church at Frankfort.

Dionysius Melander subscribed.

Paul Fagius of Argau.

Wendal Faber, steward of Seburg in Mansfeld.

Conrad Otinger of Pfortzheim, chaplain of Ulric, duke of Wirtemberg.

Boniface Wolfart, minister of the church at Augsburg.

John Aepin, superintendent of Hamburg, subscribed with his own hand.

The same did John Amsterdam of Bremen.

John Fontan, superintendent of lower Hesse, subscribed.

Frederic Myconius subscribed for himself and Justus Menius.

Ambrose Blaurer.

Again and again have I read the Confession and the Apology, submitted by the illustrious prince, elector of Saxony, and by other princes and estates of the Roman empire, to his Imperial Majesty at Augsburg. I have read also the Agreement on the Sacrament, composed at Wittemberg, with Dr. Bucer and others. I have read the articles by Dr. Martin Luther, our most venerable preceptor, written in the German language in the assembly at Smalcald, and a tract concerning the Papacy and the Power and Jurisdiction of Bishops. In my humble opinion, all these treatises accord with the sacred Scriptures and with the principles of the true and genuine catholic church. And though, amidst the great number of learned men now assembled at Smalcald, I acknowledge myself the least of all, yet because I am not allowed to await the adjournment of this assembly, I entreat you, most excellent Sir, Dr. John Bugenhagen, reverend father in Christ, to subscribe my name, should it be necessary, to all the works which I have mentioned above. For I testify by this my own handwriting, that I thus believe, profess, and shall ever teach through Jesus Christ our Lord. Done at Smalcald, Feb. 23, 1537.

JOHN BRENTIUS, Minister of Halle.

ENCHIRIDION,
OR
THE SMALLER CATECHISM
OF
DR. MARTIN LUTHER,
FOR
CURATES AND MINISTERS.

REPORT
OF THE
COMMISSIONER OF THE
BUREAU OF LANDS

FOR THE YEAR 1894

THE SMALLER CATECHISM.

PREFACE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER.

Martin Luther to all the faithful and pious curates and ministers, grace, mercy, and peace, in Jesus Christ our Lord.

The deplorable moral wretchedness which I recently witnessed, when I visited your parishes, has impelled me to publish this Catechism, drawn up in a very simple and brief form. Eternal God! what distress did I behold!—The people, especially those who live in the villages, and even curates for the most part, possessing so little knowledge of the Christian doctrine, that I even blush to tell it. And yet all are called by the sacred name of Christ, and enjoy the sacraments in common with us, while they are not only totally ignorant of the Lord's Prayer, the Apostles' Creed, and the Decalogue, but cannot even repeat the words. Why need I hesitate to say, that they differ in nothing at all from the brutes; even now, while the Gospel is widely disseminated, and they enjoy the greatest liberty of Christians?

Ye bishops, upon whom heaven has enjoined that duty, what apology will ye make to Christ for this? Ye are the men, to whom alone this decline of the Christian religion must be ascribed. Thus shamefully have ye permitted men to stray:—yours is the fault, who have never done *one* thing which it was your duty to do. I do not wish to invoke any evil upon you. But is it not great impiety,—nay, the highest presumption, to press your traditions and a *single* element of the Sacrament so far? Utterly careless and indifferent are you, whether those entrusted to your spiritual care and instruction, understand the Lord's Prayer, the Apostolic Creed, or the Decalogue, or not! Alas, alas, for you! In the name of God, then, I beg and entreat you all, curates and ministers, to discharge your duty seriously, and to watch over the people whom heaven has commended to *your* care. This ye will have accomplished most successfully, when, in conjunction with us, ye shall inculcate this Catechism upon the people, and especially upon the young. If any of you are so illiterate as not to possess *any* knowledge at all of these matters, be not ashamed to read the form prescribed by us, word by word, before your hearers, in the following order:

First of all, the ministers will be careful not to pronounce the Decalogue, or the Lord's Prayer, or the Apostolic Creed, or even the sacraments, occasionally in one way and then in another, but to use continually the *same* forms in pronouncing and explaining them to the people. I give this advice because I know, that the young and the uneducated cannot be successfully instructed, unless the same forms of expression be frequently pronounced and repeated. If you deliver your instructions now in *one* man-

ner, and then in another, untutored minds will easily become embarrassed, and all the labor which you have expended in teaching them, may be lost.

The holy Fathers kept this in view, as they desired the form of the Decalogue, of the Creed, and of the Lord's Prayer, to remain in the church, couched in the same unalterable terms. It becomes us to imitate their prudent example; and we must endeavor to deliver those instructions to the young and uneducated, without even changing a syllable; how frequently soever you may teach the Catechism, let your method be always the same. Whatever mode, then, of teaching the Catechism, you may adopt, retain it uniformly, and never depart from it. But the case is different when you teach the Gospel in an assembly of learned men;—there you may exhibit your learning; nor do I forbid you to vary your forms of expression among them, and occasionally in speaking, to assume the manner and gesture of the orator. But among the uneducated you must continually use the same forms, expressed in definite terms. And it ought to be your first exertion, to teach the Decalogue, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, word by word, in their naked and pure simplicity, so that the same expressions being frequently heard, your hearers themselves may learn to repeat them.

Should there be any who despise religion so much as to refuse to learn these things, let them be advised that they are denying Christ, and that they are any thing rather than Christians. They must not be admitted to the Sacrament of the Altar, nor to the duties of catechists, nor to the privilege of being sponsors at infant baptism; and if they wish to enjoy the right of Christian liberty, when it happens to suit their convenience, let the favor not be granted them, but let them rather be commended to the Pope and to those whom they call *officials*, even to Satan himself. It will be the duty of parents and heads of families, to refuse food to such men; and they will act commendably, if they declare to these licentious men, that the prince will expel them from their country, and drive them into banishment.

For although I agree that no one can or ought to be forced to believe, yet this menace ought in every instance to be pronounced, in order that the people may know what is right, and also what is opposed to the right of those with whom they live and procure their subsistence. For it is desirable that each one, whether he truly believes, or is involved in the mists of doubt, should understand and observe the laws of the state, which he wishes to have the privilege of enjoying.

In the *second* place,—when the uneducated have learned to repeat the words of the Catechism, an explanation must afterwards be delivered, in order that they may also understand it. And you can either employ the forms which you see here prescribed, or any other. But, as the Catechism itself should always be pronounced to the people in the same words, as I have already advised, so in the explanation of the Catechism, I could wish that the same method of instruction be continually followed, not changing even a single syllable. And for this purpose you may take sufficient time; for it is not necessary that the whole be delivered at once; but let a certain system be pursued, and one part follow the other in proper order. When the people have learned accurately what the first commandment requires, you may then pass on to the second. In this manner let the

whole be learned in regular succession; for otherwise the mind, being burdened and confused with too great an abundance, can retain nothing at all.

In the *third* place,—after you have finished this short explanation of the Catechism, you will enter the Larger Catechism, in order that your hearers may understand the whole more completely. Here you will illustrate the several commandments, the distinct parts of the Creed and of the Lord's Prayer, in their appropriate colors; you will enumerate the different duties which they enjoin, the various results and advantages which arise from them, and likewise the dangers and the losses which we incur, if we fail to discharge them. These points you will find amply unfolded every where in the writings of pious men. You will most earnestly enforce those commandments which you perceive are more likely to be violated by the people of your parish. To give an example of this,—you will press the seventh commandment most especially upon merchants, and upon those who perform manual labor. With great propriety too, this commandment may be urged upon farmers, and upon male and female servants, for they act very unfaithfully with men, and in various ways commit dishonest deeds. So it is proper to urge the fourth commandment especially upon the young and the uninstructed, that they may be quiet, observe good faith in all things, be obedient to magistrates and to parents, and not disturb the public peace. These instructions must also be illustrated by examples from sacred history,—showing where God exacted severe punishments from the violators of this commandment, or wonderfully promoted all the enterprises of those who observed it.

In this place you should make it your primary object to warn the magistrate and parents of their duty, that they may discharge their public functions with great diligence, and devote their children to the study of letters. And they ought to be urged to feel themselves bound by divine authority to attend to these duties; for should these fail to be observed, it will be a most grievous offence. What else indeed are they doing, but rejecting at the same time divine and human government, in no sense different from the most implacable enemies both of God and of men!

And here you can exhibit as it were in a table, what serious losses those bring upon their country, who do not devote their children to the acquisition of knowledge, since these very children may at some time be chosen curates or ministers of the Word, as well as to other offices, of which the world cannot be destitute without incurring very great distress. You will also add, that God will inflict the severest punishments upon parents for this neglect. Indeed I do not know that any other subject merits such special attention as this. For it cannot be told how much, in the present age, magistrates and parents have offended in this respect. And there is no doubt that it may chiefly be attributed to the influence of Satan, who designs to bring some great calamity upon Germany.

Lastly,—since the tyranny of the Pope has been weakened and diminished, you will find many every where who never approach the Sacrament, but evidently despise it as useless and unnecessary. These also must be persuaded and urged, but with this consideration, that I am unwilling, however, in this way, to force any one either to believe or to take the Sacra-

ment; and those act very injudiciously, who prescribe rules, certain times, and certain places for such purposes.

Those, however, who are engaged in the administration of the Word, ought to teach them, that without our rules, influenced by their own voluntary choice, they should come as hearers to us, and as it were compel us, the ministers of the Word, to extend the Sacrament to them. This will assuredly happen, if you teach that they incur the risk of not being regarded as Christians, who do not commune at the Lord's table at least four times a year; just as those who do not believe, or who will not hear the Gospel, are not reckoned in the number of Christians. For when Christ instituted the Sacrament, he did not say, "omit this or despise this,"—but, "This do as often as ye drink," &c. By this he certainly wishes us to do so, and not entirely to neglect or to despise it, for he says "This do."

For, if any one despises the Sacrament, it is a certain evidence, that in his estimation there is neither sin nor flesh, nor Satan, nor world, nor death, nor danger, nor hell; that is, he has no belief whatever in any of them, although he is overwhelmed in sin, and bound completely captive in the kingdom of Satan; on the other hand, he has no need of grace, nor life, nor of Paradise, nor of heaven, nor of Christ, nor of God, nor of any thing else that is good. For if he could believe himself covered with sins, and very far off from grace, doubtless he would not despise the Sacrament, in which a remedy against all sins, and a rich abundance of all good things are extended to us. Such a man would require no law to compel him to receive the Sacrament;—he would come of his own accord, driven by the weight of his sins, and rather compel you to administer the Sacrament to him.

Here you must not act by laws of compulsion, as the Pope does. But strive in your discourse, as far as you can, to portray the utility and the dangers, the necessity and the benefits, and the advantages of this sacrament, as well as the disadvantages of those who do not receive it. Then they will hasten to you voluntarily,—they will compel themselves. And if some are not influenced by these means, permit them to live in their own way,—only say this to them, that those who cannot be moved, either by necessity, or by the kindness and grace of God, which he exhibits to them in the Sacrament, may remain unmolested in the kingdom of Satan. Those, indeed, who do not stir their hearers in this way, but would prefer to force them by legal restraint, actually furnish them a pretext for despising the Sacrament. For when the ministers of the word are so wavering, it is no wonder if the hearers also become more negligent. Curates and ministers should, therefore, consider this seriously, that their present duty is far different from what it was formerly under the Papacy. Now it is the ministration of salvation and of grace; it has therefore become more difficult and laborious. And though very distressing dangers and temptations must be encountered in the ministry, yet there is neither reward nor gratitude in this world for our labors. But this ingratitude of the world, as it is connected with great impiety, cannot affect us. Christ himself has set rewards before us sufficiently noble, if only we labor with honest fidelity in his vineyard. And that we may be able to do this with greater success, may the Father of all grace vouchsafe, to whom be all praise and glory forever, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE TEN COMMANDMENTS:

AS THEY ARE MOST PLAINLY TO BE TAUGHT BY A FATHER TO HIS FAMILY.

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt have no other Gods.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love, and trust in God above all things.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not to curse, swear, conjure, lie, or deceive by his name, but to call upon him in every time of need, to pray, praise, and give thanks.

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt sanctify the Sabbath-day.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not to despise the preaching of the Gospel and his Word, but to regard it as holy, willingly to hear and learn it.

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not to despise, nor provoke our parents and superiors, but to give them honor, to serve, obey, love, and esteem them.

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not kill.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not to hurt, or afflict our neighbor in his body, or do him any harm, but to help and further him when he is in bodily need and danger.

THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so that we may live chastely and modestly in words and actions; and that each should love and honor his spouse.

THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not steal.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not to rob our neighbor of his money or possessions, nor acquire the same by spurious merchandise, or by fraudulent traffic, but to assist him in improving his condition and protecting his property.

THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not deceitfully to belie, betray, or backbite our neighbor, nor raise an evil report against him, but to excuse and speak well of him, and interpret every thing for the best.

THE NINTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not to attempt by any stratagem to obtain our neighbor's inheritance or home, nor acquire the same under the pretext of justice, but to be subservient in preserving them in his possession.

THE TENTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we should fear and love God, so as not to alienate our neighbor's wife, nor his domestics, nor his cattle, but to cause them to remain and do their duty.

What does God declare concerning all these commandments?

Ans.—He says thus:—I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and shewing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That God threatens to punish every one who transgresses these commandments. We should therefore fear his wrath, and not sin against them. But he promises grace and all blessings to all such as keep them. We ought therefore also to love him, and trust in him, and cheerfully obey his commandments.

THE CREED:

AS IT IS MOST PLAINLY TO BE TAUGHT BY A FATHER TO HIS FAMILY.

Of what does the first article treat?

Ans.—Of Creation.

How is it expressed?

Ans.—I believe in God the Father, Almighty Maker of heaven and earth.

What does this imply?

Ans.—I believe that God created me, together with every other creature; that he has given and still preserves for me my body and soul, eyes and ears, and all the other members, reason and all the senses; moreover that he has given me raiment and shoes, meat and drink, house and residence, a spouse and children, lands, cattle, and every other possession; that he amply and daily provides me with all the necessities of this life for the support of the body; that he protects me against all dangers, and keeps me from all evil. All this he does without any of my own merit or worthiness, through pure fatherly, divine goodness and mercy. For all this I am under obligation to thank and praise, to serve and obey him. This is most certainly true.

Of what does the second article treat?

Ans.—Of Redemption.

How is it expressed?

Ans.—And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended into hell; on the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

What does this imply?

Ans.—I believe that Jesus Christ, true God, begotten of the Father from all eternity, and also true man, born of the Virgin Mary, is my Lord; that he has redeemed me a wretched, lost, and condemned being; that he has delivered me from all sin, from death and the power of the devil, not with gold, or silver, but with his holy, precious blood, and by his innocent sufferings and death; so that I

might be his own, and live subject to him in his kingdom, and serve him in everlasting righteousness, innocence and felicity ; even as he is risen from the dead, lives and reigns for ever. This is most certainly true.

Of what does the third article treat ?

Ans.—Of Sanctification.

How is it expressed ?

Ans.—I believe in the Holy Ghost, in a holy Christian church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. Amen.

What does this imply ?

Ans.—I believe, that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in, or come to Jesus Christ my Lord ; but that the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me through his gifts, sanctified and preserved me in the true faith, even as he calls, assembles, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth, and preserves it in Christ in the only true faith,—in which church he daily and abundantly pardons all my sins, and the sins of all believers ; and that he shall on the last day raise me and all the dead, and give unto me, together with all believers in Christ Jesus, everlasting life. This is most certainly true.

THE LORD'S PRAYER :

AS IT IS MOST PLAINLY TO BE TAUGHT BY A FATHER TO HIS FAMILY.

How is the preface expressed ?

Ans.—Our Father who art in heaven.

What does this imply ?

Ans.—That God thereby intends to incite us to believe that he is truly our father, and that we are truly his children ; so that we may cheerfully and with all confidence entreat him as loving children do their beloved father.

THE FIRST PETITION.

Hallowed be thy name.

What does this imply ?

Ans.—That although God's name is holy in itself, nevertheless we pray in this petition that it may be sanctified by us also.

How does this come to pass?

Ans.—When the Word of God is purely and correctly taught, and we as the children of God according thereto lead holy lives. In doing this may our heavenly Father assist us! But whosoever teaches and lives otherwise than the Word of God teaches, profanes the name of God among us. Against which, mayest thou our heavenly Father, defend us!

THE SECOND PETITION.

Thy kingdom come.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That although the kingdom of God indeed comes without our prayer, nevertheless we pray in this petition that it may also come to us.

How does this come to pass?

Ans.—When our heavenly Father grants us his Holy Spirit, so that we through his grace believe his blessed Word, and live a godly life in time and eternity.

THE THIRD PETITION.

Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That although the good and gracious will of God indeed is done without our prayer, nevertheless we pray in this petition that it may also be done by us.

How does this come to pass?

Ans.—When God frustrates all wicked counsels and designs, which prevent the sanctification of his name and the coming of his kingdom,—such as those of the devil, of the world, and of our own flesh; and when he strengthens and preserves us firmly in his Word, and in the faith unto the end. This is his good and gracious will.

THE FOURTH PETITION.

Give us this day our daily bread.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That God indeed gives daily bread without our prayer, even unto all the wicked; but we pray in this petition that he would make us sensible of his goodness, so that we may receive our daily bread with thanksgiving.

What is meant by daily bread?

Ans.—Whatever pertains to the support and the necessities of this life; such as meat and drink, raiment and shoes, house, rei-

dence, and lands; cattle, money, and goods; a pious spouse, pious children and servants; pious and faithful rulers, a good government; good seasons, peace and health; discipline and honor; good friends, faithful neighbors, and the like blessings.

THE FIFTH PETITION.

And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we pray in this petition that our heavenly Father would not remember our sins, nor for the sake of the same deny our petitions, (as we are not worthy nor deserving of the things for which we pray,) but that he would give us those things through mercy; for we sin much daily, and deserve nothing but punishment. We also promise again heartily to forgive those, and freely to do them good, who sin against us.

THE SIXTH PETITION.

And lead us not into temptation.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That although God tempts no one to *sin*, yet we pray in this petition that he would preserve us; so that the devil, the world, and our own flesh, may not beguile nor seduce us into unbelief and despair, or into other great and ignominious vices; and though we should thus be tempted, that we may notwithstanding finally obtain the victory.

THE SEVENTH PETITION.

But deliver us from evil.

What does this imply?

Ans.—That we pray in this petition as in a summary, that our heavenly Father would deliver us from all manner of evil, injurious to the body and soul, property and character; and finally at the arrival of the hour of death grant us a happy departure, and graciously receive us from this troublesome world to himself, to the mansions of glory.

THE CONCLUSION.

Amen.

What does Amen signify?

Ans.—That I shall be assured that such petitions are acceptable to our heavenly Father, and heard of him; for he himself has commanded us thus to pray, and has promised that he will hear us, *Amen, amen*, signifies *yea, yea*, it shall be so.

OF THE
SACRAMENT OF HOLY BAPTISM:

AS IT IS MOST PLAINLY TO BE TAUGHT BY A FATHER TO HIS FAMILY.

FIRST.

What is Baptism?

Ans.—Baptism is not only simple water, but it is *the water* that is comprehended in God's command, and connected with his word.

Which is that word of God?

Ans.—It is that which our blessed Savior declares in the last chapter of St. Matthew: "Go ye and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost."

SECONDLY.

What does Baptism confer or benefit?

Ans.—It effects the forgiveness of sins, delivers from death and the devil, and confers everlasting salvation upon all who believe it, as the words and promises of God declare.

Which are those words and promises of God?

Ans.—Those words of our blessed Savior, recorded in the last chapter of St. Mark: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that believeth not shall be damned."

THIRDLY.

How can water effect such great things?

Ans.—Indeed it is not the water that has such effect, but the word of God that is with and in the water, and the faith trusting such word of God in the water. For without the word of God the water is mere water, hence no baptism; but with the word of God it constitutes a baptism, that is, a gracious water of life, and a washing of regeneration, in the Holy Ghost; as St. Paul says, Tit. chap. 3d: "According to his mercy he saved us by the washing of regeneration and renewing of the Holy Ghost; which he shed on us abundantly through Jesus Christ our Savior; that being justified by his grace, we should be made heirs according to the hope of eternal life." This is most certainly true,

FOURTHLY.

What does such baptizing with water signify?

Ans.—It signifies that the old man in us is to be drowned by daily sorrow and repentance, and die with all sins and evil lusts; so that daily there may come forth and arise a new man, for ever living before God in righteousness and purity.

Where is this written.

Ans.—St. Paul says, Rom. chap. 6th, verse 4: “We are buried with him by baptism into death; that like as Christ was raised up from the dead by the glory of the Father, even so we also should walk in newness of life.”



OF THE CONFESSION OF SIN.

What is the Confession of Sin?

Ans.—The confession of sin includes two parts: the first is the acknowledgment of sins; the other is the reception of absolution from the confessor or minister of the Gospel, as from God himself; so that one should by no means doubt, but firmly believe that sin is thereby forgiven before God in heaven.

What sins ought to be confessed?

Ans.—Before God we should acknowledge ourselves guilty of all sins, even of such as we do not know, as we do in the Lord's Prayer. But before the minister we ought to confess those sins only, which we know and feel in our hearts.

Which are they?

Ans.—Let every one examine his condition according to the Ten Commandments, whatever relation he sustains, whether a father, a mother, a son, a daughter, a master or a mistress, a man-servant or a maid-servant; whether he has been disobedient, unfaithful, indolent; whether he has injured any person by words or deeds; whether he has pilfered, been negligent, or has otherwise done harm.

A BRIEF FORM OF CONFESSION FOR THE INEXPERIENCED.

In this manner thou shouldst say to the confessor:

Worthy and beloved Sir, I desire of thee, that thou wouldst hear my confession, and announce forgiveness unto me for God's sake.

I, a miserable sinner, confess myself before God guilty of all manner of sins; in particular I confess in presence of thee, that I as a

man-servant, a maid-servant, &c., serve my master or mistress unfaithfully ; for here and there I have not performed what they commanded me ; I have provoked them, and caused them to take the name of the Lord in vain ; I have been neglectful to the injury of others. I have likewise been immodest in words and actions ; I have been angry with my equals, murmured and uttered imprecations against my spouse, &c. For all this I am sorry, I pray for grace, and intend to reform my life.

A master or a mistress should thus say :

In particular I confess in presence of thee, that I have not to the honor of God, faithfully reared my children and domestics. I have blasphemed, set bad examples by indecorous words and actions, done my neighbor injury, and spoken evil against him ; I have been too extravagant in charges, I have used false weights and unjust measures.

And whatever else he may have done in his vocation against the command of God, &c., may be mentioned. But if any one does not find himself oppressed with these, or greater sins, he should not be solicitous, or strive to hunt after imaginary sins, and thus make a torture out of confession, but mention one or two, which he knows. Thus :—In particular I confess, that I have once profaned the name of God ; again, I have once been immodest in expression, have once neglected this or that, &c. Let this suffice.

But if he is unconscious of any, (which however is almost impossible,) let him mention none in particular, but receive the remission after having made a general confession to God in presence of the minister.

Here the minister shall say :

God be merciful unto thee, and strengthen thy faith. Amen.

*Further :—*Dost thou believe the remission which I announce, to be the remission of God ? Answer. Yes, beloved Sir.

Then he shall say :

Be it unto thee, as thou believest. And I, by the command of our Lord Jesus Christ, announce unto thee the forgiveness of thy sins, in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost. Amen. Depart in peace.

But those who have great distress of conscience, or who are grieved and disturbed, the minister will not be at a loss to console with more passages of Scripture, and to incite to faith. This shall be only a common form of confession for the uncultivated.

OF THE
SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR, OR LORD'S SUPPER:

AS IT IS MOST PLAINLY TO BE TAUGHT BY A FATHER TO HIS FAMILY.

What is the Sacrament of the Altar?

Ans.—It is the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, with bread and wine, instituted by Christ himself, for us Christians to eat and to drink.

Where is this written?

Ans.—The holy evangelists Matthew, Mark, Luke, and the apostle St. Paul, write thus:

“Our Lord Jesus Christ, the night in which he was betrayed, took bread: and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it unto his disciples, saying, Take, eat; this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me.

Likewise after the supper, he took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying, Drink ye all of this; this cup is the New Testament in my blood, which is shed for you and for many, for the remission of sins. Do this, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.”

What is the benefit of such eating and drinking?

Ans.—This is indicated by these words “*given and shed for you for the remission of sins*”; namely, that through these words in the Sacrament, the remission of sins, life, and salvation are imparted; for where there is remission of sins, there is also life and salvation.

How can bodily eating and drinking effect such great things?

Ans.—Indeed it is not the eating and drinking which have such effect, but these words declaring: “*which is given and shed for you for the remission of sins.*” Which words, together with the bodily eating and drinking, are considered as the principal thing in the Sacrament; so that whosoever believes these words, enjoys what they indicate and declare, namely, the remission of sins.

Who then receives the Sacrament worthily?

Ans.—Fasting and keeping the body in subjection, are indeed a good external discipline; nevertheless, he only is truly worthy, and well prepared, who has faith in these words: “*given and shed for you, for the remission of sins.*” But he who disbelieves these words, or doubts, is unworthy and unprepared; since the expression “*for you*” requires only such hearts as believe.

PRAYERS.

HOW A FATHER SHOULD TEACH HIS FAMILY TO DEVOTE THEMSELVES TO
GOD IN THE MORNING AND EVENING.

MORNING PRAYER.

In the morning, on rising up, you should utter a benediction, saying :

In the name of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then kneeling or standing, repeat the Creed and the Lord's Prayer ; and if you wish you may also repeat the following prayer :

I thank thee, my heavenly Father, through Jesus Christ, thy well-beloved Son, that thou hast guarded me through the past night against all harm and danger. I pray thee, that thou wouldst this day also, defend me against sin and all evil ; that all my ways and life may be well-pleasing unto thee. For I commit my body and soul, and all I have into thy hands. Let thy holy angel be with me, so that Satan may exercise no influence over me ! Amen.

And, a hymn being sung, or the Ten Commandments repeated, or whatever else your devotion may suggest, proceed to the duties of your calling with pleasure.

EVENING PRAYER.

In the evening, on retiring, you should utter a benediction, saying :

In the name of God, the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. Amen.

Then kneeling or standing, repeat the Creed and the Lord's Prayer ; and if you wish you may also repeat this prayer :

I thank thee, my heavenly Father, through Jesus Christ, thy dear Son, that thou hast graciously guarded me all this day. I pray thee, pardon all my sins which I have committed against thee. Graciously guard me through this night. I commit my body and soul, and all I have into thy hands. Let thy holy angel be with me, so that Satan may exercise no influence over me ! Amen.

And then sleep quickly and peaceably.

HOW A FATHER SHOULD TEACH HIS FAMILY TO PRAY BEFORE AND
AFTER MEAT.

The children and domestics should modestly proceed to the table, and with folded hands, say :

The eyes of all wait upon thee, Lord ; and thou givest them their

meat in due season. Thou openest thine hand, and satisfiest the desire of every living thing.

Whereupon the Lord's Prayer, and the following prayer, may be repeated :

Lord ! our heavenly Father, bless us, and these thy gifts, which we receive from thy goodness, through Jesus Christ our Lord. Amen.

Thus after meat, they should also in like manner be modest, and with folded hands, say :

O give thanks unto the Lord ; for he is good, for his mercy endureth for ever. He giveth to the beast his food, and to the young ravens which cry. He delighteth not in the strength of the horse : he taketh not pleasure in the legs of a man. The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy. Amen.

Whereupon the Lord's Prayer, and the following prayer, may be repeated :

O God our heavenly Father ! we thank thee, through Jesus Christ, our Lord, for all thy gifts and favors. Thou dost live and reign for ever. Amen.

A TABLE OF DUTIES,

SELECTED FROM THE HOLY SCRIPTURES, FOR THE SEVERAL ORDERS
AND CONDITIONS OF MEN, BY WHICH THEY MAY BE ADMON-
ISHED OF THEIR DUTY.

OF THE CLERGY.

A bishop must be blameless, the husband of one wife, vigilant, sober, of good behavior, given to hospitality, apt to teach ; not given to wine, no striker, not greedy of filthy lucre ; but patient, not a brawler, not covetous ; one that ruleth well his own house, having his children in subjection with all gravity ; not a novice, holding fast the faithful word, as he hath been taught, that he may be able by sound doctrine, both to exhort and to convince the gainsayers. 1 Tim. 3, 2, 6. Tit. 1, 9.

OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Let every soul be subject unto the higher powers. For there is no power but of God ; the powers that be, are ordained of God. Whosoever therefore resisteth the power, resisteth the ordinance of God : and they that resist shall receive to themselves damnation. For he beareth not the sword in vain : for he is the minister of God, a revenger to execute wrath upon him that doeth evil. Rom. 13, 1-5.

* OF SUBJECTS OR COMMON CITIZENS.

Render unto Cesar the things which are Cesar's, and unto God the things which are God's. Matt. 22, 21. Wherefore ye must needs be subject, not only for wrath, but also for conscience' sake. For, for this cause pay ye tribute also: for they are God's minister's, attending continually upon this very thing. Render therefore to all their dues; tribute to whom tribute is due; custom to whom custom; fear to whom fear; honor to whom honor. Rom. 13, 5-7. I exhort therefore, that, first of all, supplications, prayers, intercessions, and giving of thanks, be made for all men; for kings, and for all that are in authority; that we may lead a quiet and peaceable life in all godliness and honesty. For this is good and acceptable in the sight of God our Savior, 1 Tim. 2, 1-3. Put them in mind to be subject to principalities and powers. Tit. 3, 1. Submit yourselves to every ordinance of man for the Lord's sake: whether it be to the king, as supreme: or unto governors, as unto them that are sent by him for the punishment of evil-doers, and for the praise of them that do well. 1 Pet. 2, 13, 14.

OF HUSBANDS.

Husbands, dwell with your wives according to knowledge, giving honor unto the wife, as unto the weaker vessel, and as being heirs together of the grace of life; that your prayers be not hindered. 1 Pet. 3, 7. And be not bitter against them. Col. 3, 19.

OF WIVES.

Wives, submit yourselves unto your own husbands, as unto the Lord. Eph. 5, 22. Even as Sarah obeyed Abraham, calling him lord, whose daughters ye are, as long as ye do well, and are not afraid with any amazement. 1 Pet. 3, 6.

OF PARENTS.

Fathers, provoke not your children to wrath; but bring them up in the nurture and admonition of the Lord. Eph. 6, 4. Col. 3, 21,

OF CHILDREN.

Children, obey your parents in the Lord: for this is right. Honor thy father and mother,—which is the first commandment with promise; that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth. Eph. 6, 1-3.

* This paragraph does not appear in the edition of 1580, but it is contained in the Leipsic edition of 1790, and it is retained here because it always follows in the detached Catechism.—TRANS.

OF SERVANTS AND HIRELINGS.

Servants, be obedient to them that are your masters, according to the flesh, with fear and trembling, in singleness of your heart, as unto Christ; not with eye-service, as men-pleasers; but as the servants of Christ doing the will of God from the heart; with good will doing service, as to the Lord, and not to men, knowing that whatsoever good things any man doeth, the same shall he receive of the Lord, whether he be bond or free. Eph. 6, 5-8.

OF MASTERS AND MISTRESSES.

And, ye masters, do the same things unto them, forbearing threatening: knowing that your Master also is in heaven; neither is there respect of persons with him. Eph. 6, 9.

OF COMMON YOUTH,

Ye younger, submit yourselves unto the elder: and be clothed with humility: for God resisteth the proud, and giveth grace to the humble. Humble yourselves therefore under the mighty hand of God, that he may exalt you in due time. 1 Pet. 5, 5, 6.

OF WIDOWS.

Now she that is a widow indeed, and desolate, trusteth in God, and continueth in supplications and prayers night and day. But she that liveth in pleasure is dead while she liveth. 1 Tim. 5, 5, 6.

GENERAL DUTIES.

Thou shalt love thy neighbor as thyself, all other commandments are briefly comprehended in this. Rom. 13, 9. And continue instant in prayer for all men. 1 Tim. 2, 1.

Let each one learn his lesson well,
And peace and order in his house shall dwell.

NOTE.—Here, forms of marriage and of baptism are inserted in the Leipsic edition of 1790, from which we translate; but as they do not appear in the original edition of 1580, and in some others, and since they are mere *forms*, we deem it unnecessary to present them in our translation.—TRANS.

THE
LARGER CATECHISM
OF
DR. MARTIN LUTHER.

THE LARGER CATECHISM.

A PREFACE

Pious, useful, and necessary; and a serious and faithful exhortation of Dr. Martin Luther, addressed to all the devout, especially to Pastors and Preachers, urging them to exercise themselves and others assiduously every day in the Catechism, as a synopsis and comprehending epitome of the whole sacred Scripture, faithfully and continually proclaiming it to the church.

We have abundant reasons not only earnestly to urge the use of the Catechism in our discourses, but to entreat and implore others to do the same; especially when we see many preachers and curates exceedingly negligent, scorning both their own duty and the very doctrine itself. This chiefly arises from the fact, that some of them conceive themselves too learned and wise for such a duty, and some, regarding nothing in the world preferable to the enjoyment of ease and carnal indulgence of the appetite, experience no other feelings in relation to this matter, than if they were appointed curates and preachers solely for the gratification of their appetite. It is not convenient for them to discharge any other engagements, than to waste and devour every thing while they are living, as they were once accustomed to do under the Papacy. And although they are at this time abundantly provided with all things necessary to be taught and preached, by the publication of so many excellent books, in which all these subjects are plainly elucidated, and though they now really possess what they were formerly accustomed to call, “Sermons made for ready use,—sleep on preacher,” yet some are so indolent or so perverse as not to think *these* volumes worth purchasing, and if they possess them, they are unwilling to look into them and to read. Merciful God! what a pernicious and detestable class of men is this, abandoned to voracity and excess, whom you would more wisely set over brutes, than the souls of the faithful!

Indeed it were to be wished, that, desisting from the useless and wearisome mutterings of *canonic prayers*, as they are called, they would, instead of these, turn over in the morning, at noon, and in the evening, some pages at least either in the Catechism or in the Prayers, or in the New Testament, or at all events would draw something else from the Sacred Books, and would repeat over the Lord's Prayer to God the Father, for their own sake and that of their flock. Let them at least show some gratitude to the Gospel, by which they have been relieved from so many evils and burdens, and let them blush with shame, not to learn any thing else from the Gospel, but the indolent, pernicious, and detestable indulgence of the flesh, which is the characteristic of the brutes. For as people in general are too coldly disposed towards the Gospel, and even with our utmost exertions, we are able to produce little or no effect, how much less success must we expect, if we now begin to be indolent and careless, as we were under the Papacy?

To these evils must be added that dangerous and destructive idea of security and contentment, which has for a long time been silently stealing upon the minds of many, and which has so infected them, that they declare with a solemn oath, that nothing in the world is easier than learning the Catechism,—so easy indeed, that with a single reading, they can accurately repeat the whole. Then immediately, as if arrived at the highest proficiency and thoroughly instructed, they throw away the book into some corner, and they are ashamed to take it in their hands again. Yea, what is still more to be deplored, some even among the nobility, are found at this day to have a spirit so depraved as to affirm that neither the curates nor preachers are any longer necessary, but that the books of themselves are sufficient, from which any one may learn these doctrines, without the aid of an authorized teacher. Hence they suffer the parishes themselves to fall to ruin and lie entirely waste, and permit their clergy almost to perish with hunger. This is conduct becoming our vulgar Germans. for such people do we Germans possess, and such are we compelled to tolerate.

But I, if indeed I may speak of myself, am also a doctor and a preacher. endowed, as I believe, with no less learning as well as experience than those who presume so much on their abilities, and who have attained so high a state of confidence; yet by no means am I ashamed to imitate the young, but just as those whom we teach the Catechism, so do I,—early in the morning, or whenever I get a moment of leisure,—privately recite word by word, the Lord's Prayer, the Ten Commandments, the Articles of Faith, the Psalms, or something of the kind. And though I have leisure every day for these lessons and studies, yet not even in this way am I able to reach the point which I am seeking, or to attain the proficiency which I desire.

So it happens, that I necessarily have to profess myself a boy and a student of the Catechism at this day,—and I profess it willingly. But these delicate, fastidious folks attain so much at a single lesson, that they leave all doctors every where behind them; they know all things; they have no further need of doctrine or of precept. Yea indeed, by this very conduct, they furnish the most conclusive evidence, that they have no concern whatever either for their own duty, or the salvation of their people, but that they equally despise both God and his Word. And though they have now caused the most terrible distress, they are not in dread of some ultimate catastrophe, but rather of the necessity which they are under of becoming students again, and of having to learn the first elements of knowledge, which they imagine have been trodden, as the saying is, under their shoes.

I entreat, therefore, these indolent epicures and presumptuous saints, for God's sake, to suffer themselves to be convinced, that they have by no means attained the proficiency which they arrogate to themselves. And besides let them never imagine that they have learned all portions of the Catechism thoroughly, and have a distinct view of them all, although these portions may seem to them to have been most diligently marked and studied. For let us make the most generous supposition;—let us grant that they do remember and understand every principle to the utmost perfection,—a thing which it is impossible to attain in this life,—yet we must never forget the endless applications and benefits resulting from a daily

perusal of these same principles, and from daily exercise in meditating and discoursing upon them. No doubt the Holy Spirit may attend this perusal, this discourse, and meditation, excite new emotions and supply new light, cause us to feel more and more every day the influence of this doctrine, and bless our labors with more valuable results,—as Christ himself has promised in Matthew 18. 20, when he says, “Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them.”

Besides there is nothing more effectual against Satan, against the flesh, and all unholy thoughts, than to study the Word of God with diligence, to form our discourses and meditations upon it; for the first Psalm declares those to be happy who meditate day and night upon the law of God. Nor can you entertain a hope of finding any charm more potent, any fragrance more resistless, against evil spirits, than to study with deep application the Word and the Commandments of God, to mingle them in your familiar conversations, to sing them and to meditate upon them. For these commandments are indeed that consecrated water, that true sign by which Satan is put to flight,—which he most cautiously shuns.

And were no other advantage to be gained by this practice, than a liberation from Satan and wicked thoughts, certainly this consideration alone ought to be a sufficient inducement for you to read, to meditate, to study, and to learn willingly this portion of the doctrine. For Satan is not able to endure or to hear the Word of God. That word, indeed, is not like the fabulous tales of the nursery, or the songs of lyric poets, but it is, as Paul says, Rom. 1. 16, “The power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth.” And that very power of God which distresses and subdues Satan most effectually, reanimates and inspirits us beyond measure. But what need is there of many words? Were I to enumerate all the advantages and beneficial results which flow from the Word of God, both my paper and my time would fail me.

People generally call Satan the author of a thousand arts,—so great and complicated is his power. But by what name shall we honor that prayer of the Lord, which not only possesses various and complicated power, but even subdues and reduces to nought that very author of a thousand arts with all his power and ingenuity? Doubtless, you will say, we should call it the author not of a thousand arts, but of many myriads. If then indeed, we esteem so lowly this power so invincible, this utility so extensive, these influences so vast, this application so unlimited,—we, who desire to be considered curates and preachers,—we especially should not only be denied the food of life, but we should be chased by the very dogs; especially since we need all these no less than our daily bread, and indeed must have them against the daily and unremitted designs and temptations of that author of a thousand arts.

Should these considerations not be sufficient to excite our minds to a diligent study of the Catechism, still the command of God alone ought to compel us. For we find in the sixth chapter of Deuteronomy, that we must never cease meditating upon these commandments, while sitting, or standing, or walking, or lying down, or rising up. We should hold them before our eyes as a sign, and carry them in our hands. Without a doubt, God imposed this severe injunction with a wise design. He well foresaw

what dangers and necessities would attend us; with what determination and obstinate pertinacity evil spirits would stand every moment in array for our everlasting destruction: and in opposition to this, our benevolent Father in heaven wished to furnish us with strong and invincible armor, by which we might be able to repel the fiery darts, the secret and dangerous attempts of these enemies. But O foolish and insensible men that we are!—though we must have intercourse among these enemies, these demons,—though we must live among them, we scorn our own defences;—heavy with stupor and drowsiness, we cannot endure to look to these defences or to remember them.

And while these plethoric and presumptuous saints really scorn the Catechism, and esteem it far too contemptible to be read and studied every day, what else, I ask, do they do but consider themselves far more learned than God himself, than all the angels, the Patriarchs, the Apostles, and all Christians? For since God is not ashamed to teach these doctrines daily,—the very best that he has to teach,—and since he frequently repeats and inculcates them over again,—never adding any thing new or inconsistent with them;—I say further, since all the saints knew nothing either better or more useful to learn, and were never able to study them too profoundly, are we not most eminent and accomplished men indeed, who, having read or heard this doctrine once, are fully persuaded that we know it all; nor is there any further necessity for us to read, as we are able to learn in one hour, what God himself has not been able to exhaust in teaching, though he has been teaching it from the creation of the world to the present time? which all the Prophets and all holy men have been ever engaged in studying, and yet of which they remain students perpetually, and necessarily must ever so remain.

For it is certainly true and indisputable, that whoever has thoroughly examined and studied the Ten Commandments, understands the whole Scripture, and is able, on trying occasions and emergencies, to excel in wisdom, counsel, and consolation, to investigate and decide civil as well as ecclesiastical disputes. He is the proper judge of all tenets, sects, and spirits, of justice and equity, and whatever can be in the world. And what else, I demand, does the whole book of Psalms contain, than mere reflections and exercises upon the first commandment! Indeed I am persuaded that those voracious and haughty spirits, ignorant of this truth, do not understand a single Psalm, much less indeed the whole Scripture. Yet these same men despise the Catechism, which is, as it were, a compendium of the whole Scripture.

Accordingly, now again I entreat and implore all Christians, especially curates and preachers, not to fancy themselves Doctors too soon, and cherish the fallacy that they knew every thing. For as with false weights and measures, so it happens with vain opinions, when they are brought under strict examination. But let them rather cultivate these studies daily, and impart these principles with diligence. Let them, besides, with due care and circumspection, defend themselves against the delusive idea of false security and presumption; let them strive most earnestly to devote their whole time to reading, learning, reflecting, meditating, and teaching, and let them not cease until they have really discovered and have become thoroughly

convinced, that they have slain Satan by superior knowledge, and have become more learned than God and all his angels. If they will employ this industry and application, I solemnly promise them, and they themselves will experience, the most gratifying results. God will cause them to become most excellent men; and they will even confess that the more they review and repeat the doctrine of the Catechism, the less they understand it; but that they find it necessary to study it continually. Then it will begin to please and delight them, like men perishing with hunger and thirst, though now, from too much satiety and pride, they cannot even bear the odor. To this end, may God grant abundant grace. Amen.

SHORT PREFACE OF DR. MARTIN LUTHER.

We have prepared this little work, with no other view than to adapt it to the instruction of the young and illiterate. Hence among the ancients in the Greek language, it was called Catechism, a word which signifies *juvenile instruction*. This book necessarily should be perspicuous and plain to all Christians, so that if any one should not have a knowledge of it, he might justly not be considered in the number of Christians, nor admitted as a recipient of the Sacraments. Just as any artist, who does not well understand the rules and principles of his profession, is properly reprehensible, and enjoys no favor among men.

Accordingly, the articles relating to the Catechism or juvenile instructor, must be inculcated upon the young with the greatest diligence, and their industry must be exercised upon these articles in no small degree. Hence the duty of a faithful and vigilant father requires, that every seventh day, he hold a careful examination of his children and family, at least once, and accurately inquire what they know or have learned about these matters, compelling them with proper seriousness and severity, to learn their Catechism. For I well remember, and we see it in our daily experience, that there have been men so slow and dull of intellect, in whom, even when they had advanced to an old age, no knowledge at all of this subject was found; nor do they manifest any at this day, although they are recipients with us of the sacraments, and share in all the ceremonies which have been instituted among Christians. Yet, while those who claim the use of the sacraments, ought to know more, they ought not to be endowed with less knowledge of Christian duties, than boys or young students. But we, for the purpose of instructing the common people, shall be content with these three parts,—which have remained in the church through a succession of ages, though very little has been properly and candidly delivered to the people,—until the old as well as the young, and whoever wishes to be a Christian, shall have been well trained and exercised in them. These divisions are those which follow:

I.—THE TEN COMMANDMENTS OF GOD.

1. Thou shalt have no other gods before me.
2. Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain.
3. Thou shalt sanctify the Sabbath-day.
4. Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother.
5. Thou shalt not kill.
6. Thou shalt not commit adultery.
7. Thou shalt not steal.
8. Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.
9. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.
10. Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.

II.—THE CHIEF ARTICLES OF THE CREED.

1. I believe in God the Father, Almighty Maker of heaven and earth.
2. And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended into hell; on the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.
3. I believe in the Holy Ghost, in a holy Christian church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. Amen.

III.—THE LORD'S PRAYER, OR PRAYER WHICH CHRIST TAUGHT.

1. Our Father who art in heaven, hallowed be thy name.
 2. Thy kingdom come.
 3. Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.
 4. Give us this day our daily bread.
 5. And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.
 6. And lead us not into temptation.
 7. But deliver us from evil.
- Amen.

These are the most necessary articles, which we should, in the first place, learn to repeat word by word; and children should be accustomed, daily, on rising up in the morning, on proceeding to table, and on retiring at night, to recite them; nor should they be permitted to eat or to drink, unless they have previously rehearsed these articles. A similar method every father of a family should observe with his domestics, male and female, namely, not to retain them with him, if they do not know, or are unwilling to learn these principles. For such rudeness, incivility, and ignorance, can by no means

be tolerated in any person, since all that the Scriptures contain, is briefly, plainly, and most simply embraced in these three parts. The beloved Fathers or Apostles, (or whoever they may have been,) have thus also comprised in a summary what the Christian doctrine, life, profession, and wisdom, are, of what they speak and treat, and which they practice.

Now, when these three articles are comprehended, it is also necessary for us to be able to rehearse and understand something concerning our sacraments which Christ himself has instituted,—namely, baptism, and the sacred body and blood of Christ,—those texts, for instance, with which Matthew and Mark conclude their gospels, and which Christ gave as his last instructions to his disciples, and then sent them forth :

OF BAPTISM.

“Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.” “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved ; but he that believeth not shall be damned.”

This much is sufficient for the unlearned to know from the Scripture, concerning baptism : and the like concerning the other sacrament, with a few simple words, as for example the declaration of Paul :

OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

“The Lord Jesus the same night in which he was betrayed took bread : and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and said, Take, eat : this is my body, which is broken for you : this do in remembrance of me.”

“After the same manner also he took the cup, when he had supped, saying, This cup is the New Testament in my blood : this do ye, as oft as ye drink it, in remembrance of me.”

Thus, then, we would have in all five parts, comprehending the whole Christian doctrine, which we should continually urge, and require it to be rehearsed word by word. For it cannot be expected, that young people learn and retain in their memory merely from preaching. Now, when these parts are properly understood, certain psalms or hymns adapted to this purpose, may also be proposed as an extension and confirmation of them ; in this way introducing the young into the Scriptures, and daily advancing them.

A mere conception and rehearsal of the words alone, should, however, not be considered sufficient ; but let the young attend preaching also, especially at the time designed for exercise in the Catechism, in order that they may hear it explained, and learn to understand what each part comprehends in itself, so that they may be able to repeat it, as they have heard it, and give an accurate and correct answer, when interrogated : so that preaching be not vain and ineffectual. For this purpose we are diligent in lecturing frequently on the Catechism, in order that the young may be influenced by it ; not in a manner lofty or learned, but very brief and simple, so that they can easily perceive it and retain it in their memories. We shall, therefore, now take up in regular order the divisions just mentioned, and endeavor so to treat of them in the clearest manner, so far as it is necessary.

PART I.

OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

*Lutheran division of Dec p. fol-
lowing index -*

THE FIRST COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt have no other gods before me.

That is, you should regard me alone as your God. What does this signify, and how should it be understood? What is it to have a god, or what is God? Answer:—A god signifies a being to whom we should look for all good, and to whom we should have recourse in every necessity; so that, to have a god, is nothing else but to rely on and to believe in him cordially; as I have frequently asserted, that it depends on the confidence of the heart alone whether we have the true God or an idol. If, then, your faith and confidence are right, your god is also right: and again, if your confidence is false and incorrect, your god is likewise untrue; for these two belong together, faith and God. Upon whatever, then, I say, you depend and have your heart fixed, that is properly your god.

Wherefore, the meaning of this commandment is, that it requires of the heart true faith and confidence, which approaches to and depends alone upon the true and the only God. And it would indicate as much as this: Be careful, and allow me alone to be your God, and do not seek after any other; that is, look unto me for whatever good is wanting with you, and seek it from me, and if you suffer want and misfortune, come and depend on me, I, I will give you sufficient, and relieve you of every need, only let your heart cleave to or rest on no other.

This I must explain by ordinary examples, in order that it may be understood and observed. Many believe they have God with all abundance, when they possess money and goods, on which they rely with so much pride and confidence, as to have no regard for any one else. Behold! these also have their god, which is called Mammon,—an idol the most extensively adored on earth,—gold and property,—upon which they have fixed all their affections. Whoever possesses treasures of gold and of wealth, feels secure, full of joy, and free from alarm, as if in the midst of Paradise. Whoever, on the other hand, possesses no wealth, trembles with doubt and fear, as if he had no idea of a God. For we shall find but few, who are not dishear-

tened, and do not mourn or complain, when they have not Mammon, to which nature cleaves and adheres through life.

In like manner, he who relies and presumes on his great ingenuity, erudition, power, influence, dignity, and friends, has a god also, but not the true and only God. You can always perceive without difficulty, how confident, secure, and haughty we are who enjoy such advantages, and how desperate and abject we are, when we do not possess these, or when they are withdrawn from us. I therefore say again, that the true interpretation of this expression, *to have a god*, is to have something upon which the heart wholly depends.

Consider, again, what follies we have hitherto pursued, and what we have done through blindness under the Papacy. When any one had pain in his teeth, he had recourse to, and adored St. Apollonia; if he was fearful that his property would be consumed by fire, he sought the assistance of St. Laurence; if he was in fear of pestilence, he paid his vows to St. Sebastian or Rochio, and similar abominations besides, without number, were practised, in which each one chose his own saints, invoking and imploring them for aid in time of need. To this class those also belong, who exceed every limit in these things, forming an alliance with Satan, in order that he may give them a sufficiency of money, or aid them in intrigue, or protect their stock, or restore their lost property, &c., as magicians and necromancers; for all these place their hearts and confidence elsewhere, rather than upon the true God, neither do they expect or seek any good from him.

In this manner, then, you easily understand what and how much this commandment requires, namely, the whole heart of man, and entire confidence upon God alone and no other. For you will be at no loss to judge, that *to have God*, is not an ability to seize or grasp him with your hands, or to enclose him in a purse, or to secure him in a chest: but this is apprehending him, when the heart embraces him and cleaves to him. To cleave unto him with the heart, however, is nothing else, but to depend upon him wholly. For this reason he desires to divert us from all external things, and to draw us unto himself, because he is the only eternal good. As if he should say: all that you have hitherto sought from the saints, and for which you have depended upon Mammon, or upon some other source, expect of me, and esteem me as him who will assist you, and bless you abundantly with all good.

From this, then, you can form an idea of what the true honor and worship of God are, which are acceptable to him, and which he

also commands under the penalty of eternal wrath ; namely, that the heart should have no consolation and confidence but in him, and should not permit itself to be torn away from him, hazarding and encountering all that is upon earth for him. On the other hand, you can easily perceive and judge how the world practise idolatry and mere false services to God ; for there never has been a nation so profligate, as not to have established and observed some kind of worship ; for all have assigned unto themselves a certain god to be revered, unto whom they looked for blessings, assistance, and consolation.

As for example, the heathen, who placed their hope on power and dominion, elevated their Jupiter as Supreme God ; others, who sought after riches, voluptuousness, prosperity, and success, venerated Hercules, Mercury, Venus, or others. Pregnant females, claimed Diana or Lucina for protection. And thus, to whatever each one's heart inclines he makes it a god ; so that, properly, even according to the view of all heathen, to have a god, is to trust and believe. But the defect exists in this, that their confidence is false and incorrect ; for it is not based on the only true God, without whom there is really no god, either in heaven or on earth.

Wherefore, the heathen really constitute an idol out of their own fantasies and dreams which they form concerning God, and rely on a mere nonentity. This is plainly the case with all idolatry. For it does not consist merely in the erection and adoration of an image ; but especially, does it consist in the heart which is intent on something else, seeking help and consolation from creatures, saints or demons, and not embracing God, nor regarding him as merciful as he really is ; much less believing that the good which it receives, proceeds from him.

There is, moreover, another species of false service to God and of extreme idolatry, which we have hitherto exercised, and which still prevails in the world, and upon which all ecclesiastical orders are based, which refers to the conscience alone. It is seeking assistance, comfort, and salvation in our own self-devised works, presuming to wrest heaven from God, and estimating the number of institutions we have founded, how often we have fasted, held masses, &c. ; which relies on and glories in these things, as if it would receive nothing from him as a favor, but desires to acquire or superabundantly to merit it of itself, precisely as if God must be at our service, and our debtor, but we his creditors. What else is this, but constituting out of God a useless representation, yes, an idol, (*Pomona, Apfelfgott,*) and regarding and elevating one's self as God ? But this is rather too subtle to be comprehended by young pupils.

But in order that they may correctly observe and retain the meaning of this commandment, this may be mentioned to the inexperienced, that we should rely upon God alone, and look unto him for all good, and await it from him, as the one who gives us body, life, meat, drink, nourishment, health, protection, peace, and all temporal and spiritual blessings; and in addition, guards us against every misfortune, and, if any adversity befalls us, he aids and delivers us; so that God alone, as fully stated, is he from whom we receive all good, and by whom we are delivered from every misfortune. Hence, I conclude that we Germans, from ancient times, call God (more beautifully and elegantly, than any other language) even by this name, deriving it from the word *Gut* (good), as he who is an eternal fountain-head which overflows with pure *good*, and from which issues all that is and can be called good.

For even if much good is otherwise obtained from men, it is, however, still received from God; for it is effected through his command and order. For our parents and all who are in authority, are commanded to do all kinds of generous offices to us, as well as each one towards his neighbor; so that we do not receive these from them, but from God through them. For the creatures are only the hand, the channel, and the medium, through which God gives all things, as he gives the mother's breasts and milk to nourish her infant, and grain and every kind of vegetables springing from the earth for support; none of which blessings or products a creature is able to produce by himself.

For this reason, no person should undertake to receive or to present any thing, unless it be commanded of God, that it be acknowledged as his gift, and thanks returned to him for it, as this commandment requires. These *media*, therefore, for the reception of benefits through the creatures, are not to be rejected; nor should other ways and means than those which God has commanded, be sought through presumption; for this is not receiving from God, but seeking from one's self.

Let each one, then, be careful in himself that this commandment above all things, be greatly and highly esteemed, and that it be not regarded with derision. Ask and search your own heart carefully, and you will truly discover whether it cleaves to God alone, or not. If you have a heart which can look unto him for all good, especially in time of need and want, as well as reject and forsake all that is not God, you have the true and the only God. Again, if it cleaves to something else, from which it expects more benefits and assistance,

than from God, and does not approach him, but flees from him, when adversity surrounds it,—you have an idol.

In order, then, to let us know that it is not the will of God that this commandment should be lightly esteemed, but sincerely observed, he has adjoined to it, first, a terrible menace, afterwards, a beautiful and consolatory promise; which should be diligently urged and impressed upon young people, so that they may take them into consideration, and retain them:

“I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me, and keep my commandments.”

These words relate, indeed, to all the commandments, as we shall hereafter show, but they are here applied, with great justice, to this chief commandment, as the human body is guided by the wisdom and prudence of the head, upon which the happiness of life chiefly depends. Learn, then, from these words the wrath of God against that man who depends on any other being; that his anger ceases not even to the fourth generation: that we are not so secure, so well fortified as the undevout imagine, who pretend that little depends upon these things. On the contrary let us learn how benevolent and gracious he is, how his beneficent goodness extends over many thousands of those who trust and believe in him with their whole heart. He is a God who does not suffer us to turn away from him with impunity; nor will his anger subside till in the fourth generation, even until we shall be entirely exterminated. He, therefore, wishes to be feared,—not to be despised.

This he has also shown in all past history, as the Scriptures abundantly testify, and experience still teaches daily; for from the beginning he has entirely extirpated all idolatry, and, on account of it, has overthrown both Jews and Gentiles, as he now in our day also overthrows all false worship, so that ultimately, all, who persist in it, must be destroyed. Therefore, although, at the present day, haughty, mighty, and opulent misers are found, who insolently depend on their mammon, disregarding of God’s anger or pleasure, as if they would without hesitation venture to withstand his wrath; yet they shall, however, not be able to accomplish it, but before they are aware of it, they shall be wrecked with all upon which they have depended, even as all others have been destroyed, who presumed to be more secure and powerful.

And on account of these obstinate persons who imagine that because God connives for a time, and permits them to rest in their se-

curity, that he is unconscious of it, or feels no concern about it, he must necessarily execute his wrath and his punishment, since he cannot forget it until it is visited on children's children, so that every one may perceive and observe that with him there is no jest. For these are those to whom he refers, when he says: "Them that hate me;" that is, those who persist in their pride and haughtiness, unwilling to hear that which is preached or proclaimed to them. If they are reprov'd, so that they may judge themselves and amend their lives, before the punishment is executed, they become furious and enraged, so that they really deserve wrath; as we daily experience at the present time in bishops and princes.

But terrible as are these menacing words, so much the more powerful is the consolation contained in the promise, that those confiding in God alone, shall be certain that he will manifest mercy to them; that is, exhibit pure goodness and favor, not only to them, but also to their children, unto thousands and thousands of generations. This should indeed move and urge us to place our hearts on God, with full confidence, if we desire to have all blessings, temporal and eternal, since the Supreme Majesty itself so kindly offers, so affectionately induces, and so abundantly promises.

Let each one, then, reflect seriously and profoundly upon this matter, so that it may not be regarded as having been declared by a man; for it effects for you either eternal salvation, blessings, and happiness, or everlasting wrath, misery, and grief. What more would you have or desire, than his promise so affectionate, that he will be yours with every blessing, and protect and assist you in every necessity? But alas! here is the defect, the world does not believe any of these, or regard them as being the words of God, because it sees that those who place their trust in God, and not on mammon, suffer grief and want, and the devil opposes and resists them, so that they may obtain no money, favor, or honor, nay, scarcely sustain life. Again, those who serve mammon, have power, favor, honor, and wealth, and every convenience in the sight of the world. We must, therefore, embrace these words, even in opposition to this apparent contradiction, and know that they do not lie or deceive, but that they must be verified.

Reflect for yourself, or make inquiry, and tell me, what have those ultimately accomplished, who have devoted their whole care and attention to the accumulation of great wealth and possessions? And you will find, that they have lost labor and toil, or, even if they accumulated great treasures, they decayed and went to dust, so that they themselves never enjoyed their possessions, nor did their wealth

descend even to the third generation. You will find examples enough in all history and in the experience of aged persons, to this effect; only observe them, and turn your attention to them. Saul was an illustrious king, chosen of God, and a pious man; but when he was established on his throne, and permitted his heart to decline from God, depending on his crown and power, he lost all his authority and possessions, with all that he had, even so that none of his children survived. Again, David was a poor man, so persecuted and despised, that his life was nowhere secure; yet he was to be preferred to Saul, and become king; for these words had to continue and be verified, since God cannot lie or deceive. Do not then allow the devil and the world to deceive you with the outward appearance, which truly endures for a time, but ultimately vanishes.

Let us, therefore, carefully study the first commandment, so that we may see that God will not suffer any presumption or reliance on any thing else, and that he requires nothing more of us than a cordial confidence of all good from himself, in order that we may proceed judiciously and correctly, and use all the blessings which he confers, not otherwise than a mechanic uses his tools or materials in his vocation, and afterwards places them away; or, than a traveller enjoys an inn, nourishment, and a couch; only for temporal necessities,—each one in his condition according to the order of God, not permitting any thing to become his lord or idol. This is sufficient concerning the first commandment, which it was necessary for us to explain at length, since upon it the sum and source of all piety turn, because, as we have already said, if the heart is reconciled with God, and this commandment is observed, all the others follow properly.

THE SECOND COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain.

Precisely as the first commandment instructs our hearts and inculcates faith, so this commandment conducts us, and directs our lips and tongues towards God. For the first, which proceeds from the heart and exhibits itself, is language. Now, as I have given instruction above how to answer, what it is to have a God: so you must likewise learn to comprehend in a simple manner the meaning of this and all commandments, and to recite them. When it is asked:—How do you understand the second commandment, or what is meant by a vain use or misapplication of God's name? Answer in the most brief manner thus:—This is misusing the name of God,

when any one mentions God the Lord, in whatever manner it may occur, for the confirmation or defence of falsehood or any other species of vice. Therefore, so much is commanded, in order that no one may repeat the name of God with levity, or take it in his lips, when the heart is at the same time, or at least should be conscious of the opposite; for instance, among those who make oath before a court of justice, and one party bears false witness against the other. For there is no way in which the name of God can be more misused, than in falsifying and deceiving by it. Let this be considered the plain and simple meaning of this commandment.

From this every one can easily calculate for himself when and how variously the name of God is misused, although it is impossible to enumerate all the abuses; let it however be briefly said that the divine name is abused, first, in political transactions and secular matters, which concern pecuniary interests, property and honors, whether it be publicly before court, in the market, or some other place, in which persons swear or make false oath by the name of God, or appeal to their souls to sustain the matter. And especially is this customary in matrimonial affairs, where two associate and privately betroth themselves to each other, and afterwards deny with an oath the affiance. But most of all does this abuse occur in spiritual matters which concern the conscience, when false preachers arise and deliver their lying errors for the Word of God.

Behold, all this is decorating one's self with the name of God, or it is a desire to be fair and righteous, whether it happens in ordinary secular transactions, or in high subtle matters of faith and doctrine. And slanderers also belong to the class of liars, not only the most rude, who are well known to every one, and who without fear disgrace the name of God, (who belong not to our school, but to that of the executioner,) but also those, who blaspheme the truth and Word of God, and impudently affirm that it is of the devil: concerning these persons it is not necessary at present further to speak.

Here then, let us learn and take to heart how much depends on this commandment, so that we may with all diligence guard ourselves against, and dread every kind of abuse of the divine name as the greatest sin which can be externally committed. For lying and deceiving, are in themselves great sins; but they become much more weighty when men wish to justify them, and refer to the name of God to confirm them, and make it a pretext for turpitude, so that from one lie, a twofold falsehood, yes, a series of falsehoods, results.

God has, for this reason, annexed also to this commandment a solemn threat, which reads thus: "For the Lord will not hold him

guiltless that taketh his name in vain." That is, it shall not be allowed in any one, nor passed by with impunity. For as little as God will leave unavenged, the turning away of our hearts from him, so little will he suffer us to use his name as a disguise for falsehood. But alas! it is a general misfortune in the world, that, few as there are who cordially rely on God alone, there are equally few who do not use the name of God for defending falsehood and all manner of wickedness.

For this disingenuous propensity we all possess by nature, that, whoever has committed a crime, ardently desires to disguise and conceal his disgrace; and there is no one so audacious as to boast in presence of any one of the crime which he has perpetrated: all would rather have it kept concealed than to have it known. For if you charge a person with something of this kind, he will abuse the name of God, by representing his villany as piety, his disgrace as an honor. This is the common course of the world, like a great deluge overflowing every region of country. Therefore we have as reward that which we seek and deserve, pestilence, wars, famines, destructive fires and inundations, impious wives, children, and domestics, and all kinds of evil. From what other source should so much calamity originate? It is still a great favor that the earth supports and nourishes us.

It is therefore, above all things, necessary to train up and accustom young people to hold high in their estimation this commandment and others, and if they transgress, they should immediately be checked, the commandment should be presented to them, and continually be impressed, in order that they may be reared up, not only by chastisement, but also in fear and reverence to God.

Thus you perceive then, what an *abuse* of the divine name is; namely, (in order to a brief recapitulation,) to use it either simply in defence of falsehood, and in publishing any thing which is not true, or in cursing, swearing, deceiving, and in short, in whatever manner a person may desire to commit evil. It is necessary, moreover, for you to know how the name of God may be *used correctly*; for by these words, which he declares: "Thou shalt not take the name of God in vain," he gives us to understand that his name should be used in a proper manner. For it was revealed and given to us for the very purpose of being used to our benefit. It conclusively follows, since it is here forbidden to use the divine name in defence of falsehood or vice, that it is, on the other hand, commanded to use it in defence of truth and all honorable actions; for instance, if a person swears truthfully where required and where it is necessary; also when we teach correctly; when we invoke this name in adversity, praising it

and returning thanks to it in prosperity. All of which is comprised and commanded as it were in a summary, in the fiftieth Psalm, verse 15: "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee, and thou shalt glorify me." In all these cases the invocation is sincere and his name used appropriately; or, as the Lord's Prayer expresses it, it is hallowed.

In this manner you have the sum of this whole commandment illustrated. And from this view it is easy to solve the question, with which many teachers have perplexed themselves: why is it forbidden in the Gospel to swear, when at the same time Christ, St. Paul, and other saints have frequently sworn? This is briefly the meaning: no one should swear to wicked things, that is, to falsehoods, and in cases in which it is unnecessary; but in allowable cases and for the benefit of our neighbors we should make oath: for it is really a good deed, through which God is praised, truth and justice established, falsehood suppressed, the parties reconciled, obedience exhibited, and contentions settled: for here God himself interposes, and discriminates between justice and injustice, good and evil. But if one party swear falsely, they have their sentence, that they shall not escape punishment. And even if it be delayed for a while, nothing shall prosper for them of that which they obtain by perjury, and hold in their possession: and they shall never enjoy it peaceably; as I have observed in many persons who abjured their matrimonial vows, that they afterwards enjoyed no pleasant hours, nor healthful days, and thus they were miserably injured both in body and soul, as well as in property.

For this reason I say and admonish, as before, that children should, in due time, be trained up, by admonition and warning, by restraint and chastisement, to avoid falsehood, and especially the use of God's name to confirm it. For if they are allowed to indulge this practice, nothing good will result from it; as it is now evident that the world is worse than it formerly was, and that there is no government, obedience, fidelity, or faith existing, but an audacious, ungovernable race, with whom neither instruction nor punishment avails any thing. All which is an exhibition of the displeasure of God, on account of such wilful contempt of this commandment.

They should, moreover, be urged and induced, on the other hand, to venerate the name of God, and continually to have it in their lips in all that may occur and present itself before their eyes; for this is the true honor of the divine name, to expect all consolation of him, and to call upon him for the same, so that the heart (as we have al-

ready stated) first gives God his honor, through faith, afterwards the lips, through confession.

This is a salutary and useful custom, and very effectual against the devil, who is continually around us, and lurking about for an opportunity to bring us into sin and shame, into difficulty and misery, but very reluctantly hears, and cannot long abide if the name of God is mentioned and implored from the heart; and many terrible and calamitous disasters would befall us, if God, through the invocation of his name, did not protect us. I have felt and truly experienced myself, that frequently sudden and grievous misfortunes have been averted and removed, during such supplication. To conquer the devil, I say, we should continually have this sacred name in our lips, so that he may not be able to injure us as he desires.

It also conduces to this effect in all casual dangers and distresses, if we cultivate the habit of committing ourselves unto God daily, with soul and body, wife and children, domestics and all that we have. From this custom the recital of benedictions, short prayers, and other morning and evening blessings, has originated and continues to exist. Again, children should be exercised in uttering a prayer when any thing terrific and horrible is seen or heard, saying:—Lord God, protect;—Help, beloved Lord Christ. So again, on the other hand, when any thing good occurs unexpectedly, no matter how insignificant it is, we should say:—God be praised and thanked,—This he has conferred on us,—just as the children were accustomed in former times to fast, and pray to St. Nicholas and other saints. But the practice we recommend, would be acceptable and more pleasing to God, than any monastic life or Carthusian sanctity.

Thus, in a manner adapted to their capacities and juvenile tastes, we might train the young in the fear and honor of God, so that the first and second commandments might move on harmoniously, and be in continual exercise. Then something good might be accomplished, and persons might grow up, in whom a whole country could rejoice and delight; and this would be the proper method for rearing up children correctly, since they can be gained by affection and tenderness. For that which we enforce by the rod and chastisement alone, produces no good effect; and even if it succeeds to a considerable extent, they will not however continue dutiful longer than the rod lies on them. But here it takes root in the heart, if God is feared more than the rod and staff. This I state in a manner so simple, for the benefit of the young, that it may at some time have its effect; for while we are preaching to children, we must also prattle with

them. Thus we have provided against the abuse of the divine name, and taught its proper use ; which should consist not only in words, but also in practice and conduct, so that we may know that it is well-pleasing to God, and that he will as abundantly reward it, as he will horribly punish that abuse.

THE THIRD COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt sanctify the Sabbath-day.

We have named the Sabbath-day after the Hebrew word *Sabbath*, which properly signifies to rest, that is, to cease from labor ; hence we are accustomed to say : Cease working, or sanctify the Sabbath. Now, in the Old Testament, God selected the seventh day, and designed it as a cessation from labor, and commanded it to be kept holy in preference to all others ; but with respect to this external cessation from labor, this commandment was designed for the Jews only, that they should cease and rest from secular labor or employments, so that both man and beast might be refreshed, and not exhausted by constant labor. They afterwards, however, viewed it in a manner too contracted, and they grossly misused it, so that they censured it in Christ also, and could not tolerate such works as they themselves had performed on that day, as we read in the Gospel ; precisely as if this commandment were fulfilled in not performing any external work, which was not, however, the design, but it was more particularly intended that they should sanctify the Sabbath, or day of rest, as we shall hear.

This commandment, therefore, with respect to its outward and literal sense, does not concern us Christians ; for it is wholly an external thing, like other ordinances of the Old Testament, confined to certain conditions, persons, times, and places, which are all now abrogated through Christ. But in order that we may draw up for the uninformed, a Christian sense of what God requires of us in this commandment, it is necessary to observe, that we keep the Sabbath-day, not for the sake of intelligent and matured Christians ; for these have no need of it : but in the first place, on account of physical reasons and necessities which nature teaches and requires for the common mass of people, men-servants and maid-servants, who attend during the whole week to their labor and employments, so that they may also have a day set apart for rest and recreation : in the second, mostly for the purpose of enabling us to embrace time and opportunity on these Sabbath-days, (since we cannot otherwise

embrace them,) to attend to divine service; so that we may assemble ourselves to hear and treat of the Word of God, and to praise him, by singing and prayer.

But this, I say, is not so confined to time, as it was among the Jews, that it must be precisely this or that day; for one day is not better in itself than another, but it should be daily attended to; but since the common class of people cannot attend to it, we should reserve one day in the week, at least, for this purpose. Inasmuch, however, as Sunday has been set apart from old for this purpose, we should therefore let it remain so, that the Sabbath may be observed with uniformity, and that no one create disorder through unnecessary innovation. This is accordingly the simple meaning of this commandment, that, since festivals are observed, they should be devoted to the study of God's Word; so that this day is most appropriate for preaching the Gospel, for the sake of the young and the indigent; yet we should not view this cessation from labor in a manner so contracted, as forbidding other casual labor which we cannot avoid.

Wherefore, when it is asked, what is meant by the declaration, *Thou shalt sanctify the Sabbath-day?* Reply:—'To sanctify the Sabbath-day, signifies to keep it holy. What then is implied by keeping it holy? Nothing else but to be employed in holy words and actions; for this day needs no sanctification for itself, because it is created holy in itself; but God desires it to be holy to you. Thus it becomes holy and unholy on your account, if you perform holy or unholy things on it.

How, then, is this sanctification accomplished? Not by remaining idle at home, and performing no coarse labor, nor by decorating the head with a wreath, and dressing in the finest and best apparel, but, as I have said, by being engaged in the Word of God, and exercising in it.

And in truth we Christians should always observe such holiday, performing nothing but holy duties; that is, we should be occupied in the Word of God daily, and bear it on our lips and in our hearts. But since all of us, as already said, have not time and leisure, we must devote a few hours during the week to the young, or at least a day to the multitude, so that we may be concerned about this alone, and especially urge the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, and thus regulate the whole course of our life and employment according to the Word of God. Now, at whatever time this duty is earnestly attended to, then a holiday is observed correctly, when it is not, it should not be called a Christian Sabbath;

the same within the
 Church.
 Adding upon the apex of two dis-
 tinations, the Jewish and the Chris-

for a mere remission of labor can be observed by persons who are not Christians; as the whole multitude of our ecclesiastics stand daily in the church, singing and exclaiming, but sanctify not the Sabbath-day; for they neither preach nor urge the Word of God, but even teach and live contrary to it.

For the Word of God is the sanctuary above all sanctuaries, yes, the only one which we Christians know and have. For even if we had all the relics of saints, or holy and consecrated clothes together in a mass, it would still benefit us nothing; for it is all a dead thing, which can sanctify no one. But the Word of God is the treasure which makes all things holy, and through which all the saints themselves were sanctified. In whatever hour, then, the Word of God is taught, preached, heard, read, or considered, the person, day, and work, are thereby sanctified,—not on account of the external performance, but on account of the Word which constitutes all of us saints. For this reason, I always say that our lives and works must be governed and directed according to the Word of God, if they are to be well-pleasing to him and holy; where this is done, this commandment is fully and effectually observed. On the other hand, whatever duty and work are instituted or performed independent of the Word of God, they are unholy in his sight, no matter how beautiful and splendid they may appear, even if decorated with the specious garb of holiness; of this character are the humanly instituted Ecclesiastical Orders, who do not know the Word of God, and seek holiness in their works.

Observe then, that the power and efficacy of this commandment, do not consist in *cessation from labor*, but in keeping it holy; so that this day has a particular holy duty. For other labor and employment are not properly styled holy exercises, unless the person be previously holy. But here a work must be performed, through which a person becomes holy himself,—a thing which, as already shown, occurs through the Word of God alone; and to this effect places, times, persons, and the whole external service of God, are appointed and ordained, so that it may be publicly and assiduously exercised.

Since then, so much depends on the Word of God, that without it no Sabbath-day can be sanctified, we should know that God desires to have this commandment strictly observed, and that he will punish all who reject his Word and are unwilling to hear and learn it, especially at the time appointed for this purpose. Therefore, not only those sin against this commandment, who grossly abuse and impiously profane the Sabbath-day, as those who on account of their

avarice or wantonness, neglect to hear the Word of God, or lie in taverns, full and stupid like swine; but those also, who listen to the Word of God as to idle talk, and attend preaching merely for the sake of fashion, and when the year has gone by, know as little as they did before. For heretofore it was the opinion that the day was truly sanctified, if one mass or the Gospel was heard on Sunday; but no one made inquiry about the Word of God, nor was it taught by any one.

And now, in truth, although we have the Word of God, still we do not suppress this abuse; we allow persons to preach to us, and to admonish us continually, but hear them without earnestness and concern. Know, therefore, that it is not sufficient for us to hear only, but we should also learn and observe; and think not, that it is left to your discretion, or that little depends on it, but that it is God's commandment, who will require of you how you have heard, learned, and honored his Word.

In like manner, those fastidious spirits must also be reproved, who, after having heard a sermon or two, are so vain as to presume that they understand it perfectly themselves, and have no further need for a teacher. For this is even the sin, which was heretofore numbered among irrevocable sins, and called *akedeia*, (*ακηδεια*), that is, listlessness or disgust,—a malignant and pernicious calamity, by which the devil fascinates and deceives many hearts, in order that he may overwhelm us, and clandestinely again draw away from us the Word of God.

Permit us then to say to you, that even if you understood the Word of God in the most perfect manner, and were master of all things, you are still, however, perpetually under the influence of Satan, who ceases neither day nor night, in his endeavors to deceive you, in order that he may excite in your heart unbelief and evil thoughts, against the former, and all commandments; you must, for this reason, perpetually have in your heart, lips, and ears, the Word of God. But if the heart remains idle and the Word does not find a response, he obtrudes himself, and has accomplished the injuries before we are aware of it. The Word has, moreover, such efficacy, that, if it is considered, heard, and treated of with sincerity, it never vanishes without fruit, but always excites new ideas and emotions, and creates a pure heart and pure thoughts; for it is not inactive or lifeless, but it is an energetic, living word. And if no other motive or necessity urges us to a consideration of the Divine Word, this should excite every one to it, since through it Satan is alarmed and repelled, and this commandment fulfilled, and since it is more acceptable in the sight of God, than all glittering, hypocritical works,

THE FOURTH COMMANDMENT.

We have hitherto treated of the first three commandments, which have express reference to God. *First*, that we should trust in him with our whole heart, fear and love him in all our life. *Second*, that we should not misuse his holy name in lying, or in evil deeds, but use it to the praise of God, and to the benefit and salvation of our neighbors and ourselves. *Third*, that we should hear and make a diligent use of the Word of God, on festival or holidays, in order that all the deeds of our life may harmonize with it. And now the other seven follow, which relate to our conduct towards our fellow men, and among which the first and greatest is :

Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother.

Upon this paternal and maternal state, God has particularly conferred praise above all other states which are subordinate to him, by commanding us not merely to love, but to honor our parents. For in reference to brothers, sisters, and neighbors in general, he commands nothing higher than to *love* them, so that he separates and distinguishes father and mother from all other persons on earth, and places them next to himself. For, to *honor* is much more exalted than to *love*, as it embraces not only love, but submission, humility, and reverence, which are due to the dignity of the person. Nor does he simply require us to address them in a friendly tone and with reverence, but above all to conduct and demean ourselves, both in our hearts and in our deportment, so as to hold them in high estimation, and regard them as next to God. For that which we should honor from our hearts, we should indeed esteem pre-eminently.

It is necessary, then, that young persons be impressed with the idea that they should regard their parents in God's stead, and consider that even if they be poor, weak, full of faults, and peevish, they are nevertheless a father and a mother given of God. They are not deprived of this honor on account of their deportment or defects; for this reason the personal appearance of the parents, however deformed, is not to be considered, but the will of God who thus created and ordered it. Otherwise we are, in truth, all alike in the sight of God, but amongst us things cannot exist without this inequality and distinction. For this reason, it is also commanded of God that you observe obedience to me as your father, and that I have the superiority.

Learn, then, *in the first place*, what that honor towards parents

is which is required in this commandment; namely, that we should esteem them sincerely and worthily, as the highest treasure on earth: should demean ourselves towards them submissively in our expressions; and not treat them maliciously, or look upon them with contempt or disdain, but yield to them in their claims, and keep silence even if they act imprudently. Finally, we should manifest this honor in our conduct; that is, to serve, assist, and maintain them, by our labor and possessions, when they are old, sick, feeble, or in need; and all this not only willingly, but with humility and reverence, as if it were done in the presence of God. For whoever knows how he should esteem them in his heart, will not let them suffer from hunger and want, but will regard them as equal and superior to himself, and impart to them whatever his ability and possessions will permit.

In the second place, observe and mark how great, how good, and holy a work is here proposed for children, which alas! is entirely neglected, and no one perceives that God has commanded it, or that it is a holy, divine declaration and doctrine. For if it had been held in this light, each one could have perceived from it, that those must be holy people, who live according to these words; consequently no one would have dared to establish any course of monastic life, or any ecclesiastical orders, had each child adhered to this commandment, and if he could have directed his conscience towards God and said: "If I am to perform good and holy works, I know of none indeed that are better than to render all honor and obedience to my parents, since God has ordered it himself; for what God commands must be far more noble than all that we can devise of ourselves; and since there can be found no higher or better master than God, there can undoubtedly be no better doctrine than that which he gives. Now, he teaches abundantly what men should do, if they wish to perform really good works; and inasmuch as he commands these works to be done, he implies that they are well-pleasing to him. If then, it is God who commands this, and if he knows nothing better to propose, I shall be unable to amend it."

Thus, we would have had pious children, properly instructed, and well reared, who would have remained in the service of their parents, so that they might have seen great pleasure and enjoyment in them. But no one has obliged the command of God to be honored thus, but has suffered it to lie forgotten, or to be violated, so that a child is incapable of reflection, and while it gapes with silly astonishment after that which we have devised, not once does it consult God on the subject.

Let us, therefore, for God's sake, once teach young persons to banish from before their eyes all other things, and fix their attention first upon this commandment, and if they wish to serve God with really good works, to perform that which is desirable to their parents, or to those to whom they are subject instead of their parents. For the child, conscious of this and observing it, has the great consolation within his heart, which enables him to say with freedom and honor (in defiance of, and in opposition to all who are engaged in their own self-chosen works): "Behold! this work is well-pleasing to my God in heaven; of this I am certain." Let others come forward and boast of their great, their numerous, their tedious, and laborious works, and then let us see whether they can produce a single work, more noble and important than the obedience due to father and mother, which God has commanded and which he places next to the obedience due to himself; and although, where his word and will, maintain their proper ascendancy and obedience, nothing can be superior to the will and word of parents, yet this will and word must remain in due subserviency to him, and must not conflict with the preceding commandments.

You should, therefore, rejoice in your heart, and thank God, because he has chosen you, and rendered you worthy to perform a work so precious and acceptable in his sight. And you should esteem it great and valuable, even if it is looked upon by others as the most insignificant and despicable, not on account of our worthiness, but because it is comprehended and embraced in the treasure and sanctuary, namely, God's word and command. O how dear a treasure it would be to all Carthusians, monks, and nuns, if they could produce in all their religious austerities one single work before God, which was done according to his command! and could say with joyful hearts in his presence, "We are now certain that this work is well-pleasing to thee!" How shall they, these poor, wretched persons, appear, when they shall stand before God and all the world, blushing with shame in the presence of a child that has lived in obedience to this commandment, and when they must acknowledge that with the purposes and performances of their whole life, they have not been worthy to serve it with a drink of water? This justly happens to them on account of their diabolical perversion, since they trample God's command under foot, in torturing themselves to no purpose, with their own self-devised works, reaping derision and shame as their reward.

Should not the heart leap and melt with joy, when it goes to work and performs that which is commanded, so that it can say, "Be-

hold, this is more noble than all Carthusian sanctity, even if they torture themselves to death by fasting and praying on their knees without intermission?" For in reference to the former, we have an indubitable declaration and testimony that he has commanded it; but in reference to the latter, he has not enjoined a single word. But this is the misfortune and lamentable blindness of the world, that no one believes it. Thus the devil has fascinated us with false holiness and a pretence of our own works.

It is therefore my ardent desire, (I repeat it again,) that we might open our eyes and our ears, and take these things to heart, in order that we may not at some time be led away again from the pure Word of God, by the delusive arts of the devil. Thus we might look for a happy period in which parents could enjoy the more peace, love, friendship, and harmony in their families, and children could gain the whole affection of their parents. Again, if they are pertinacious, and will not do that which they should, unless they are chastised, they provoke both their God and their parents, and by this means deprive themselves of this treasure and peace of conscience, and bring upon themselves nothing but misfortunes. And it is on this account, that we find the unfortunate state of affairs now existing in the world, of which every one complains, that both young and old are extremely dissolute and ungovernable, destitute of fear and honor, carrying nothing into effect unless forced by chastisement, and in a clandestine manner taking from each other, and perpetrating whatever they can. On account of which God also punishes them, so that they fall into all manner of calamity and distress. And we also see, that parents themselves are generally uninformed; one simpleton instructs another; and as the parents have lived, so the children live after them.

And this should, I say, be the first and the greatest consideration urging us to an observance of this commandment, on account of which, if we were destitute of parents, we should desire God to propose for us wood and stone which we might call father and mother. How much more, since he has given us living parents, should we delight in being able to render honor and obedience to them, since we know that it is so well-pleasing to the Supreme Ruler of the universe and to all angels, and that it is so unpleasant to all devils, —the noblest work which can be performed after the high service of God comprised in the foregoing commandments! the giving of alms and all other acts of benevolence, are still unequal to it. For God has placed this state in the first order, yes, he has instituted it in his own stead on earth. This will and pleasure of God should be a sufficient

cause and inducement for us to do with willingness and delight whatever we are able.

We are indeed, under still further obligation in the sight of the world, to be thankful for the favors and all the benefits which we have received from our parents. But here the devil again so exerts his influence in the world, that children forget their parents, as all of us forget God, and no one considers how God nourishes, defends, and protects us, and how many blessings he confers upon our bodies and souls: especially if an unhappy period approaches, we become angry, and murmur with impatience, and all the blessings which we have received during our whole lives, sink into oblivion. Even so do we also act towards parents; and there is no child that can perceive and consider these things, unless it receives grace from the Holy Spirit. This wicked disposition and ingratitude of the world, God plainly perceives; for this reason he impels and admonishes us with commandments, in order that each one may reflect what his parents have done for him, learning from this that he derived his body and life from them, that he is nourished and reared up by their care, without which there have been hundreds of times in which he might have perished in his destitution. Therefore, it is rightfully and properly said by aged and wise persons: *Deo, parentibus et magistris non potest satis gratiæ rependi*: that is, it is impossible for us ever to compensate sufficiently God, parents, and teachers. Whoever observes and considers this, will indeed render all honor to his parents without compulsion, and act towards them in the most affectionate manner, as those through whom God has given him all blessings.

Besides all these things, this should also be considered a great motive urging us the more to an observance of this commandment, namely, that God has annexed to it a temporal promise, saying: "So that thou mayest live long in the land where thou dwellest." Observe then the earnestness of God in reference to this commandment, since he indicates not only that it is acceptable with him, and that he has pleasure and delight in it, but also that it shall be well with us, and we shall prosper abundantly, reaping the enjoyments of life with all blessings. Therefore, St. Paul, Eph. 6, 2, 3, also has reference to it, and highly commends it, where he says: "This is the first commandment with promise, that it may be well with thee, and thou mayest live long on the earth." For, although the other commandments have their promise also included, yet it is not so expressly and explicitly laid down in any of them as it is in this one.

Here then you have the fruits and the reward of this commandment, that he who observes it, shall have quiet days, prosperity, and suc-

cess : on the other hand, you have also the penalty, that he who is disobedient, shall perish the sooner, and shall not enjoy his life. For the enjoyment of long life signifies in the Scriptures, not only a far advancement in years, but the possession of all that pertains to long life,—good health, wife and children, subsistence, peace, good government, &c., without which this life cannot be enjoyed happily, nor prolonged to an advanced age. Now, if you will not obey your father and mother, and receive instruction, then obey the executioner ; if you will not obey him, then obey the all-subduer, which is death. For in a word, it is the design of God, either, if you obey him, and render love and service to him, to compensate you abundantly with all blessings, or, if you provoke him, to send upon you both the executioner and death. Whence arise so many criminals, whom we must daily subject to the gallows, to decapitation, and the crushing wheel, unless it is from disobedience ? Because they would not suffer themselves to be reared up in piety, and in this way, through the judgment of God, they cause us to behold their misfortunes and distresses. For very often does it happen that such reprobate persons die an unnatural and untimely death.

But the pious and the obedient have the blessing of living a long life in peace and tranquillity, and of seeing their children's children (as already said) in the third and fourth generation. And experience teaches us that wherever there are prosperous and ancient families, of excellent character and blessed with many children, the cause of it truly is, that some of them have been well reared, and have held their parents in due estimation. Again, it is written, Psalm 109, verse 13, in reference to the ungodly : “ Let his posterity be cut off ; and in the generation following let their name be blotted out.” Let it therefore be told to you, how great a thing obedience is in the sight of God, since he esteems it so highly, permits it to be so well-pleasing unto himself, so abundantly rewards it, and moreover, so strictly regards it as to punish those who violate it.

I mention all these things in order that they may be deeply impressed on the minds of the young. For no one easily believes how necessary this commandment is, yet hitherto it has not been esteemed or taught under the Papacy : each one considers the words simple and easy, and thinks he is already well acquainted with them ; for this reason he passes them by, and gapes after other things, without seeing and believing that he so greatly provokes God, when he neglects this commandment, or that he performs a work so precious and acceptable when he observes it.

In the consideration of this commandment, it is also necessary further to treat of various forms of obedience to superiors, who have to command and to govern. For from parental authority all other powers emanate and are extended. For if a father is not able in himself to educate his children, he chooses a teacher for the purpose of instructing them; if he is unable to do this, he applies to his friends or neighbors for assistance; but if he departs this life, he commits and delivers them to the government and guardianship of others appointed for this purpose. Again, he must have under him also domestics, men-servants and maid-servants, for the administration of his domestic affairs, so that all who are called masters and mistresses, serve instead of parents, and must receive power and authority from them to rule. Hence they are all called fathers according to the Scripture, as they exercise in their government the office of father, and they should bear fatherly hearts towards their subjects. From ancient times, the Romans and many other people, have called masters and mistresses by terms equivalent to *Patres et Matres familias*; that is, fathers and mothers of families. Thus, they also called their princes and sovereigns, *Patres patriæ*, that is, fathers of the whole country, to our great shame who wish to be Christians, because we do not confer this title upon them, or at least this regard and honor.

In whatever respect then a child is indebted to father and mother, all are likewise indebted, who are included in the family government. For this reason, men-servants and maid-servants should endeavor not only to render obedience to their masters and mistresses, but also to hold them in honor as their own fathers and mothers, and to perform all that they know is required of them, not through compulsion and severity, but with pleasure and delight, even for the reason already assigned,—because it is the commandment of God, and more acceptable with him than all other works. On this account they should even be willing to remit some of their wages, and should rejoice that they are able to procure a master and mistress, that they have a conscience so quiet, and know how to perform true golden works; which have heretofore been neglected and despised, and for which so many, in the name of the devil, entered into monasteries, resorted to pilgrimages and indulgences, with shame and a troubled conscience.

Now, if we could impress these things on the deluded multitude, a little girl might leap with joy, praising and thanking God, and by her moderate labor, for which she in other respects receives her subsistence and reward, obtain such a treasure as all, who are regarded as most holy, do not possess. Is it not an excellent glory,

to know and to say, when you have performed your daily duties in your domestic employment, that it is better than all the holiness, all the austerities, of monastic life? And besides, you have the promise that you shall increase and prosper, with every blessing. How would you be more happy, or live more holy, so far as regards your operations? For in the sight of God faith alone truly justifies, and serves him alone, but works serve the people. Here you have every blessing, defence, and protection, a cheerful conscience and a gracious God besides, who will abundantly reward you; and you are truly a nobleman if you only are pious and obedient. But if you are not, then you have, in the first place, nothing but the wrath and vengeance of God, no peace at heart, and finally, every misfortune and distress.

Now, those whom this will not move and induce to piety, we commit to the executioner and the conqueror of all. Let each one, therefore, who will suffer himself to be admonished, consider that with God it is no jest, and know that God speaks to him, and requires obedience. If you obey him, then you are a beloved child; but if you despise this admonition, you have reproach, distress, and grief for your reward.

In a similar manner we should also speak concerning obedience to civil magistrates, who, as remarked, derive their authority from paternal jurisdiction, which authority is very extensive. For here are fathers not of a single family only, but of as many persons as there are citizens, freemen, or subjects under their jurisdiction; for through them, as through our parents, God gives us our subsistence, houses, and homes, and sustains us in them. Therefore, since they bear with honor this name and title, as their highest glory, we are also under obligation to honor and esteem them greatly, as the most valuable and precious treasure on earth.

Now, whoever is submissive, obedient, and subservient to them, and performs with cheerfulness whatever belongs to the honor due them, knows that he acts acceptably before God, and receives as a reward peace and prosperity. If he will not perform this duty through love, but rejects and opposes their authority, and will not comply with it, he should also know that he is entitled neither to favors nor blessings; and if he expects to gain one guilder by it, he loses ten times more in some other respect, or falls into the hands of the executioner, or perishes through wars, pestilence, and famine, or realizes no pleasure in his children, or suffers injuries, injustice, and violence from domestics, neighbors, or strangers and tyrants; and thus receives such compensation and reward as he seeks and deserves by this disobedience,

Could we once be persuaded that these works are so acceptable in the sight of God, and so abundantly rewarded, we would possess all the superabundant blessings which our hearts desire. But since we observe the word and command of God so contemptuously, as if they had been declared by a worthless man, let us also consider whether we are the men who are able to enter into contest with him. How difficult will it be for Him to reward us again? Therefore, we would better live under the favor, peace, and blessing of God, than under his wrath and displeasure. Wherefore do you suppose that at present the world so abounds with perfidy, infamy, distress, and murder, except because every man, being his own lord and ruler, regards no one, and does whatever he pleases? For this reason, by one knave God punishes another; so that if you deceive or disrespect your lord, another comes, who treats you in the same manner again, yes, so that in your family you must suffer ten times more from your wife, children, or domestics.

We feel our misfortune indeed; we murmur and complain about perfidy, violence, and injustice; but we will not perceive that we are knaves ourselves, who have justly deserved punishment, and still do not reform. We do not desire to be in possession of grace and righteousness; for this reason we justly have nothing but adversity without any mercy. There must yet, however, be some pious persons on earth, since God still grants us so many blessings. For our sake we should not retain a farthing in the house or a straw in the field. With so many words I had to urge all these things, in order that they might for once be taken into due consideration, and that we might be liberated from the blindness and distress in which we have been so deeply involved, and might have a proper conception of the word and will of God, and embrace them with sincerity. From this word and will we would learn how we may have peace and prosperity abundantly, and happiness, temporal and eternal.

Thus we have fathers of two descriptions intimated to us by this commandment; the one a natural father, presiding over the family; the other an official father, presiding over the country. Besides these, there are also spiritual fathers, not as those in the Papacy, who have falsely arrogated this title to themselves, without, however, exercising any fatherly office; for those alone are worthy to be styled spiritual fathers, who govern and direct us through the Word of God, as St. Paul, 1 Cor. 4, 15, glories in calling himself by this name, where he says: "For, in Christ Jesus, I have begotten you through the Gospel." Inasmuch, then, as they are fathers, this honor is due to them also, even above all others; but here it is least rendered;

for, indeed, all the honor which the world confers upon them, is to banish them from the country, and begrudge them a morsel of bread; and in a word, they must (as Paul says, 1 Cor. 4, 13) be the filth of the world, and the offscourings of all things.

It is still necessary, however, to impress upon the minds of the multitude, that those who wish to be called Christians, are under obligation in the sight of God to hold as worthy of double honor, such as attend to the welfare of their souls, so as to manifest kindness and favors towards them, and to provide for them; for this purpose God will grant sufficient means. But here every one resists and opposes, filled with fear that his body might perish. And now we cannot support one learned, virtuous, and faithful preacher, where we heretofore satisfied the appetites of ten epicures. For this reason we richly deserve that God should deprive us of his Word and blessing, and permit false preachers to rise up again, who lead us to the devil, and consume our labor and subsistence.

Those, however, who regard the will and commandment of God, have the promise of being abundantly compensated for whatever they bestow both on natural and spiritual fathers, and for the honor they render unto them: not that they shall have bread, raiment, and money for a year or two only, but long life, sustenance, and peace, and shall be rich and blessed forever. Therefore, only perform your duty, and let God take care to support you and procure a sufficiency for you; for, since he has promised it, and has never yet broken his word, he will also not deceive you. This should indeed create such a heart as might melt for joy and love towards those to whom our honor is due, and induce us to lift up our hands and thank God with joyfulness, who has given us such a promise as we should seek to the extremity of the world. For even if all the world were to combine, it would still be unable to add a single moment to life, or to produce from the earth a single grain; but God is able and willing to give you every thing abundantly, according to the desire of your heart. Now, whoever neglects this promise, or rejects it, is unworthy to hear a single word of God. We have now sufficiently discussed every duty relating to those who are subject to this commandment.

It were, moreover, well also to instruct parents in reference to the requirements of their duty, and the manner in which they should conduct themselves towards those who are committed to their government; which, although it is not expressed in the Ten Commandments, is, however, strictly enjoined in many other portions of the Scripture. God desires it also to be understood, even in this com-

mandment, when he mentions father and mother; for it is not his will that there should be knaves or tyrants in the management of this office; nor does he attribute this honor to them, that is, power and authority to rule, so that they might permit themselves to be worshipped; but they should consider that they are under the control of God, and they should above all things discharge the duties of their office with sincerity and good faith, not only in nourishing their children, domestics, subjects, &c., and in providing for their physical wants, but mostly in rearing them up to the praise and honor of God. Think not, therefore, that it is left to your own choice and pleasure, but that God has strictly commanded and enjoined it, unto whom you will have to render an account for it.

But here we again have the wretched misfortune, that the duties of this office are neither regarded nor observed by any one. We act as if God had given us children for the purpose of gratifying our vanity and folly; as if he had given us domestics as beasts of burden, to be used only for the accomplishment of labor, or subjects to act according to our caprice, permitting them to act as if we were unconcerned about what they learn, or how they live; and no one perceives that it is the command of the Supreme Being, who earnestly requires and expects this; or that so much importance is attached to a proper attention to the young. For if we wish to have ingenious and pious persons, both for civil and ecclesiastic government, we must in truth spare no pains, care, or expense, in educating and rearing our children, so that they may serve God and their fellow men; and we should not consider only how to accumulate money and possessions for them; for God indeed can nourish and enrich them without our aid, even as he does every day; but for this reason he has given us children, and committed them to our care, that we should educate and rule them according to his will; otherwise he has no use for father and mother. Therefore, let each one know that he is under obligation, at the forfeiture of divine grace, to bring up his children above all things, in the fear and knowledge of God, and if they are endowed with talents, to let them learn and study useful arts and literature, so that they may be beneficial to society.

Now, if these things were attended to, God would abundantly bless us and grant his grace, so that persons of this character might be trained up, and the condition of the country and the people ameliorated; and moreover, that there might be useful citizens, chaste and economical females, who might in future rear pious children and families. Think, then, for yourself how fatal an injury you occasion, if you are negligent and suffer any want of effort on your part,

in having your children brought up to useful and virtuous habits; and moreover, you bring upon yourself condemnation and wrath, and thus deserve hell through your own children, even if you were otherwise pious and holy. Wherefore, because these things are despised, God so terribly punishes the world, that we have no discipline, peace, or government, of which we all complain, but we do not perceive that it is our fault; for as we train them, so we have ill-bred, disobedient, children and subjects. Let this suffice as an admonition; for, to discuss this at length belongs to another occasion.

THE FIFTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not kill.

We have now treated both of spiritual and civil government, that is, divine and parental authority and obedience. We accordingly take leave of our own residence, and proceed to our neighbors, for the purpose of learning how we should live among each other,—each individually towards his neighbor. Wherefore, God and the magistracy are not comprehended in this commandment; nor does it divest them of their authority which they have for inflicting capital punishment. For God has committed his right in punishing criminals, to magistrates in the room of parents, who in former times (as we read in Genesis) were under obligation to bring their children to judgment, and to sentence them to death. For this reason, that which is forbidden here, is forbidden particularly to private persons, and not to the magistracy.

Now this commandment is easy to be understood, and it is frequently inculcated, since we annually hear it in the Gospel, Matt. 5, 21, where Christ himself explains it, and comprises it in a summary, namely, that we should not commit murder, either with our hands, or by the devices of our hearts, or by our lips, or by our testimony or treachery, or assistance and counsel. Every one is, therefore, here forbidden to be angry, excepting, as remarked, those who occupy God's place on earth, that is, parents and magistrates. For it behooves God and persons who are God's representatives, to be indignant, to rebuke and to punish, even on account of those who transgress this and other commandments.

The reason and necessity, however, for this commandment are, that God truly knows how wicked the world is, and the numerous misfortunes attending this life, on account of which he has instituted this commandment and others, to protect the pious against the un-

godly. Now, as there are various oppositions against every commandment, so there are here ; because we must live among many persons who injure us, and give us occasion to be at enmity with them : as when your neighbor sees that you have better residence and lands, more blessings and prosperity from God than he has, he becomes offended, envies you, and speaks nothing good of you.

Thus, through the instigation of the devil, you get many enemies who accord you no blessings, either temporal or spiritual. Therefore, when we see these men, our hearts become inflamed with anger, and begin to burn with a desire of revenge. Thence arise contentions and conflicts, from which calamity and murder finally result. Here God, like a kind and indulgent father, interposes as arbitrator, and desires those contentions to be allayed, so that no misfortune may result, nor one person injure another. And, in a word, by this commandment he wishes each one to be protected, defended, and guarded against the violence and injuries of every one, and that it should be placed as a rampart, a fortress, and a safeguard for our neighbors, in order that they may not be molested, or receive any personal injury.

The import of this commandment is, that no one should injure his neighbor on account of any malicious act whatever, even if he richly deserves punishment. For where murder is forbidden, there every cause is also forbidden from which murder might arise ; for many a one, if he does not commit murder, utters imprecations and harbors malicious designs, which, if executed, would soon destroy our lives. Inasmuch, then, as this principle is implanted in all of us by nature, and since it is the universal custom that one will not suffer any injury from another, God intends to eradicate the root and the cause through which our hearts become embittered against our neighbor ; and he intends to accustom us to have this commandment continually before our eyes, viewing ourselves in it as in a mirror, beholding the will of God, and submitting unto him with sincere confidence and adoration of his name, the injustice which we suffer, and thus permitting those to indulge their fury and rage, to do whatever they can ; so that we may learn to assuage our wrath, and to keep an enduring, patient heart, especially towards those who give us occasion to be angry, that is, towards our enemies.

Therefore, the whole sum and substance of these words, *not to kill*, should be expounded to the inexperienced in the most explicit manner :—*In the first place*, that no one should commit an injury, first, with his hands or by his deeds ; second, he should not use his tongue for the purpose of doing injuries. Moreover, he should not employ or justify any kind of means or ways by which another might

be injured. And, finally, his heart should not be at enmity with any one, or imprecate evil upon him, through anger and hatred. So that both body and soul should be innocent with respect to every one, but especially in respect to him who wishes or causes us evil; for, to do evil to him who wishes us well and does us favors, is not human but diabolical.

In the second place, not only he who perpetrates evil, violates this commandment; but he who is able to favor, assist, restrain, control, and protect his neighbor, so as to prevent him from being molested, or from receiving injuries in his body, and does not do it, also violates this commandment. For if you permit a naked person to depart when you are able to clothe him, you have suffered him to perish with cold; if you see some one suffering with hunger, and you do not administer to him, you let him starve; so, if you see an innocent man sentenced to death, or in similar distress, and do not rescue him, if you know of ways and means for this purpose, you have put him to death; and it will not benefit you if you do allege that you did not give your consent, advice, or assistance, to this act; for you have withheld from him that love, and deprived him of that kindness, by which his life might have been saved.

For this reason God also justly calls all those murderers, who do not advise and assist in the exigencies and dangers of body and life; and he will pass a most terrible sentence upon them on the day of judgment, as Christ himself, Matt. 25, 42, 43, announces, saying: "I was a hungered, and ye gave me no meat: I was thirsty, and ye gave me no drink: I was a stranger, and ye took me not in: naked, and ye clothed me not: sick, and in prison, and ye visited me not." That is, you would have permitted me and my followers to perish with hunger, thirst, and cold; to be torn by wild beasts; to linger in prison, and to be destroyed by want. What else is this but reprimanding you as murderers and blood-hounds? For, even if you have not perpetrated this in deed, you have, however, so far as it pertains to yourself, permitted your neighbor to remain and perish in misfortune.

This is as much as if I were to see some one laboring to extricate himself from deep water, or some one who had fallen into fire; and if I could extend my hand to rescue either of them from danger, and still would not, should I not appear before the world a murderer and a wicked wretch? Therefore, the whole design of God is, that we should not permit injury to befall any person, but that we should manifest all kindness and love to him; and this has, as already said, especial reference to our enemies; for to do good to our friends, is but a heathen virtue, as Christ, Matt. 5, 46, says.

But here we have the Word of God again, by which he wishes to incite and urge us to true, to noble, and excellent works : as meekness, patience, and in short, love and kindness towards our enemies. And he would remind us continually to remember the first commandment, from which we learn that he is our God, that he desires to assist, defend, and protect us, and to subdue our inclination for revenge.

These things should be urged and impressed upon the minds of the multitude ; then we would all find abundant occasion to do good works. But this would not be preaching for the monks ; it would more probably retrench their religious orders, and bring in a remarkable depression of Carthusian sanctity ; it would perhaps be called even a prohibition of good works, and a destruction of monasteries. For by this means the condition of common Christians would avail equally as much as these orders, yes, much more ; and all persons could see how they impose upon, and deceive the world with their false, hypocritical affectation of holiness, since they scatter to the winds this and other commandments, and regard them as unnecessary ; as if they were not commandments, but counsels ; and, moreover, since they have impudently boasted and proclaimed their fictitious orders and works as the most perfect course of life, so that they might lead an easy life, without opposition and endurance. For this reason they have also entered into monasteries, in order that they might not be molested by any one, or have necessity to do a favor for any one. But know, then, that those are the right, the holy, and divine works, in which God and the angels rejoice ; and in contrast with which, all human sanctity is filth and pollution, which deserves nothing but wrath and condemnation.

THE SIXTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not commit adultery.

The following commandments are now easy to be understood in themselves from the interpretation of the preceding ; for they all tend to the protection of our neighbor against every kind of injury. They are, indeed, arranged in a judicious order. *First*, they secure his own person ; *second*, they respect the person nearest himself, or the nearest good next to his body, namely, his consort, who is one flesh and blood with him ; so that no one can do him greater injury in any thing. It is for this reason explicitly said here, that we should bring no disgrace on his wife. And it speaks particularly concerning adultery ; because, among the Jewish people every one was commanded to enter into the matrimonial state. Therefore youths

were married at a very early age ; consequently a state of virginity was of no moment among them ; nor was a life of *fornication* or obscenity tolerated ; hence *adultery* was the most general species of unchastity among them.

But inasmuch as there exists among us a shameful mixture of all kinds of vices, and lewdness of the basest order, this commandment is likewise directed against every species of unchastity, no matter how it may be called ; and it forbids not only the outward act, but also every cause, inducement, and means, leading to it ; so that our hearts, our lips, and our whole bodies may be chaste, giving no occasion, assistance, or advice tending to immorality. And not only so, but it also requires us to guard, protect, and rescue our neighbor where there is danger or necessity ; and, moreover, to assist and advise him, so that he may sustain his honor. For, if you tolerate this, when you are able to prevent it, or if you connive at it, as if it did not concern you, you are guilty, as well as the perpetrator himself. This commandment, then, briefly requires each of us to live chaste himself, and also to assist his neighbor in doing so. For God wishes the consort of every one to be secured and protected, by this commandment, against insult and outrage.

But inasmuch as this commandment has so express a reference to a state of matrimony, and since we have occasion to speak of it, you should in the first place observe how highly God honors and requires this estate, in confirming and protecting it by his command. He has confirmed it above in the fourth commandment : “ *Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother.*” But here, as we have said, he has secured it. He therefore desires us also to honor it, and to observe and use it as a holy, blessed state, since he has instituted it superior to all others ; and for this reason he created male and female differently, as it is evident, not for lustful or licentious purposes, but in order that they might live together in a state of matrimony, and be fruitful, nourishing their families, and rearing them up to the honor of God.

For this reason God has also most abundantly blessed it above all other states ; and besides, he has crowned it with all things in the world, and committed all things to it, in order that this state might be richly and amply provided for. Consequently, the state of matrimony is no jest or device ; but it is a sacred and a divine reality ; for, to operate against vice and Satan, it is of the utmost importance to God, that persons be reared up to serve the public, to promote the knowledge of God, a happy life, and all virtues.

Wherefore, I have always taught that no one should contemn this

state, nor hold it as dishonorable, as the blind world and our false ecclesiastics do; but it should be viewed according to the Word of God, with which it is adorned and sanctified, so that it is not only set on an equality with other states, but that it is more exalted and excellent than all others, whether they be imperial, sovereign, episcopal, or whatever they may be. For both spiritual and secular estates must humble themselves, and all be found in this condition, as we shall hereafter hear. It is, therefore, not a particular, but a universal and an exalted state, which prevails and extends through all Christendom; yes, through the whole world.

In the second place, it is also necessary for you to know that this is not only an honorable state, but that it is also necessary and earnestly commanded of God, and that in general, in all conditions or occupations of life, male and female who are fitted for the enjoyment of matrimony, should be found living in these social ties; some few however excepted, whom God has peculiarly excluded, because they are not adapted to it, or whom he has exempted through extraordinary gifts, so that they are enabled to observe chastity without marriage. For where nature predominates, as implanted by the Creator, it is impossible to remain chaste without matrimony; for flesh and blood remain flesh and blood, and the natural inclinations and attractions maintain an unfettered, an unconstrained influence, as every one sees and feels. Wherefore, in order that it might be the more easy to avoid, in some measure, unchastity, God has instituted marriage, so that each one might have his allotted wife, and live with her satisfied; although the grace of God is still necessary, that the heart may also be chaste.

From this you perceive how our Papistical rabble—priests, monks, and nuns, who condemn and prohibit marriage, strive against the order and command of God, avow perpetual chastity, presume to observe it, and besides, deceive the illiterate with false words and appearances. For no persons have less love and desire for chastity, than those who, on account of their pretended holiness, avoid matrimony, and either publicly and impudently indulge in fornication, or privately exercise a worse practice, which decency forbids us to name; as alas! has been too much experienced. And, to be brief, even if they abstain from this deed, yet their hearts are full of unchaste thoughts and evil desires, so that there are incessant ragings of passion and internal sufferings, which may be avoided in married life. Therefore, by this commandment every illegitimate vow of chastity is condemned, and leave given, yes, it is even commanded to all poor captivated consciences, deceived through their monastic

vows, to forsake their unchaste conditions, and to enter into a state of matrimony ; for even admitting that monastic life might be godly, it still does not lie in their power to observe continence ; and if they do continue in this observance, they must sin to a greater extent against this commandment.

These things I have said in order that young persons might be persuaded to obey their desires for matrimony, and that they may know that it is a happy state, and acceptable in the sight of God. For by this means we might be able, in the course of time, to restore it to its due honor, that this polluted, obscene, and inordinate course of conduct, might be diminished, which now prevails every where in the world in a manner so offensive to chastity, with fornication and other shameful vices which have resulted from a contempt of married life. For this reason parents and magistrates are also under obligation to see to the young, that they be reared in decency and honesty ; and when they are grown, that they be seasonably joined in honorable matrimony ; for this purpose God will grant his blessings and his favors, so that peace and joy must result from it.

From all this, let it be said then, in conclusion, that this commandment requires each one not only to live chastely in thoughts, words, and actions, in his condition, that is, especially in his matrimonial estate, but also to love and esteem the consort that God has given him. For if conjugal chastity is to be observed, husband and wife must above all things live together in love and harmony, so that one confide in the other from the heart, and with entire reliance. For this is one of the most important points which create love and desire for chastity, and from which, where it exists, chastity will follow spontaneously. For this reason Paul also so diligently admonished married persons to love and honor each other, Eph. 5, 22 ; Col. 3, 18, 19. Here, then, you have very precious works, yes, numerous and excellent good works, which you may cheerfully perform in opposition to all ecclesiastic orders established without the word and command of God.

THE SEVENTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not steal.

After your own person and your consort, your temporal property is most valuable to you. God desires to have this protected also ; and he has commanded that no one should encroach on, or diminish the possessions of his neighbor. For, to steal signifies nothing else

than to obtain the property of another through unjust means; in which view are briefly comprehended frauds against your neighbor, of every species, in all kinds of traffic. Now this is a common vice and very extensive, but so little noticed and regarded that it exceeds all limits, insomuch that if all should be executed who are thieves and yet do not wish to bear this name, the world would soon be desolate, and wanting both in executioners and in gallows. For we must, as already said, regard as stealing, not only an extraction from the coffer and the purse secretly, but also taking advantage in the market place, in all mercantile establishments, taverns, houses of refreshment, work-shops, and in short, wherever we execute the ordinary transactions of commerce, receive or give money for merchandise or labor.

As—for the purpose of illustrating the matter in a somewhat simple and plain manner, for the benefit of the common people, in order that we may see how pious we are—when a man-servant or a maid-servant is not faithful in the performance of duty, and causes injury or permits it to be perpetrated which could easily have been prevented; or when, in some other respect, there is an indifference or carelessness, on account of negligence, indolence, and malice, causing the master or mistress trouble and provocation, or any thing of this kind which can happen through a wicked disposition; for I do not speak of the injuries which are done unintentionally or through oversight. In this manner I say, you can annually defraud your master or mistress out of a guilder, yes, thirty or forty, or even more, for which, if some one else had secretly taken or withdrawn them, he must have been suspended by the rope; but here you can venture to act in a presumptuous manner, and no one dares to call you a thief.

In a similar manner I also speak in reference to the mechanic, to workmen, and hirelings, who all exercise their presumption, not knowing how they shall defraud their employers enough, and in addition they are indolent and unfaithful in their labor. All these surpass by far, secret thieves, against whom we can guard by means of locks and bolts, or if they are apprehended, we can so confine them that they will not repeat the same offence. But against the former no one is able to guard, nor dares to look upon them with disrespect, or to charge them with theft. Consequently, we would much rather sustain loss immediately from our purse. For here are my neighbors, my good friends, and my own domestics, to whom I look for favors: and these first of all deceive me.

Thus also in the market and in common places of traffic, this kind

of dishonesty is exceedingly frequent, where one deceives and cheats another openly with false measures, unjust weights, and adulterated coin, and defrauds by crafty cunning and strange imposture, or by deceptive artifices. And again, when one overcharges and oppresses another wilfully, thus overreaching and perplexing him. And who can relate or think of all? In short, this is the most common art, and it produces the most numerous class of criminals on earth. And now if some one should seriously contemplate the world through all professions, he would see nothing but an extensive banditti of notorious thieves. Wherefore, these men are in reality usurpers, highway robbers, and prowling thieves—not robbers of chests or secret thieves, who seize the property of another by force; but those who preside in office and are called illustrious noblemen, and honorable and pious citizens, exercising injustice and robbery under pretext of honesty.

Yes, here we might be silent in reference to inferior, individual thieves, if we were to assail the great, the powerful, and notorious chief robbers, with whom lords and princes enter into confederacy; those who daily pillage not a town or two, but all Germany. Yes, where would remain the head and supreme protectress of all thieves—the holy See of Rome, with all her adherents, who has dishonestly usurped the treasures of the whole world, and holds them in possession to this day? In short, the usual course of procedure in the world is this,—whoever can openly steal and rob, passes freely and securely, unpunished by any one, and wishes to be honored besides; while the little clandestine thieves, who have once committed theft, must bear the shame and punishment, so that those others may appear pious and honorable; yet they should know that they are the greater thieves in the sight of God, who will inflict upon them such punishment as they deserve.

Inasmuch, then, as this commandment is so comprehensive, as we have now shown, it is necessary to exhibit and illustrate it to the multitude, so that they may not act so inconsiderately and securely, but that the wrath of God may be presented and exhibited to their view. For, these things we must preach not to Christians, but mostly to knaves and rogues, to whom the judge, the prison-keeper, or the executioner should more justly preach. Therefore, each one should know that he is under obligation, at the hazard of incurring the divine displeasure, not only not to injure his neighbor, or to take the advantage of him, either in commerce, or in any contract, or to conduct himself in any degree perfidiously towards him, but also to

protect his property faithfully, and to promote his interest, especially if he receives competent remuneration and sustenance for it.

Now, whoever maliciously contemns these things, may persist in his course, and escape the executioner, but he shall not evade the wrath and punishment of God ; and although he may exercise his pride and arrogance for a considerable length of time, yet he shall be a fugitive and a beggar, and suffer, besides, all manner of distress and misfortune. And still you persist in this unjust course, when at the same time it is your duty to protect the property of your master or mistress, for which service you receive your daily support,—receiving your wages unjustly, and desiring, besides, to be honored as a nobleman. Of this character there are many, who exhibit impertinent pride towards their masters and mistresses, unwilling to serve them through love and obedience, in defending them against injuries. But observe what you gain by this conduct : when you shall have received your wages, and are sitting at your ease, God will send all misfortunes upon you, and you shall discover and experience again, that where you have obtained one farthing by fraud, you will have to repay thirty fold.

We meet with workmen and laborers of similar character, whose intolerable arrogance we must now hear and bear, as if they were noblemen, occupying the possessions of other persons, and every one must give them as much as they desire. Well, only let them pillage as long as they can, God will not be unmindful of his commandment ; he will also reward them as they have deserved ; and he will not suffer them to flourish, but to degenerate, and they shall never meet with success or prosperity. Indeed, if there were a proper government established in the country, this licentiousness could soon be checked and resisted, as in former times it was among the Romans, where persons of this character were immediately apprehended, in consequence of which others were necessarily deterred.

And a similar fate shall all others meet, who constitute nothing but a place of oppression and robbery out of the open and public market, in which the poor are defrauded daily, and new oppressions and extravagances practised—each one availing himself of the market according to his own arbitrary will, arrogantly and insolently boasting, as if he had legal authority to dispose of his possessions at prices as extravagant as he desires, and as if no one had a right to make complaint against him. With these we shall bear indeed, and let them exercise their oppressions, frauds, and covetousness ; but we have confidence in God, that he will, however, when they have extorted and oppressed for a considerable length of time, pronounce a curse on them ; so that their grain shall spoil in the garner, their

vintage shall fail, and their cattle shall be destroyed in the stall. Yes, if you cheat or defraud any one out of a guilder, your whole treasure shall depreciate and be consumed, so that you shall never be able to enjoy it with peace.

We perceive, indeed, from daily experience, that nothing which is acquired either by fraud or theft, prospers. How many are there who make every effort, both day and night, to accumulate wealth, and still do not become a farthing richer? And even if they accumulate an abundance, they must still endure so many calamities and misfortunes, that they cannot enjoy it with peace, or transmit it to their children. But inasmuch as no one is solicitous about these things, proceeding as if they do not concern him, God must visit us otherwise, and teach us morals, by levying upon us one exaction upon another, or by sending us a swarm of soldiers for guests, who instantly pillage our coffers and purses—not ceasing while we possess a farthing; and besides this, burn and destroy our houses and residence, violate and murder our wives and children.

And in short, even if you steal much, rest assured that twice as much will be stolen from you; and whoever robs or obtains any thing by violent and unjust means, must suffer from another who will treat him in a similar manner. For God well knows how to employ one thief to punish another, since one robs and defrauds another; where could we otherwise procure ropes and gallows sufficient to punish the thieves?

Whoever, then, will permit himself to be advised, should know that it is the commandment of God, and that it is not to be regarded as a jest. For even if you condemn us, defraud, steal, and rob, we shall, however, endeavor to bear it, and to endure and suffer your arrogance, and to commiserate and forgive it, according to the Lord's Prayer; for we know that the pious shall have sufficient, and that you do yourself greater injury than any one else. But here, when the beloved poor call upon you for assistance, who are now so numerous, and who are compelled to support themselves by their daily penny, beware that you do not act as if every body were dependent on your mercies: practising extortion and oppression upon them, and sending those away arrogantly and inhumanly, to whom you should be kind; they depart miserable and sorrowful, having no one to whom they can complain; their cries and entreaties shall ascend to heaven: here I admonish you again, be on your guard, as if it were against Satan. For these sighs and entreaties will not be jests, but they will have an energy, an influence which is more weighty than you and all the world can bear. For it will touch *Him* who accepts

poor, distressed hearts, and who will not leave this unrevenged. And if you condemn these, and act arrogantly, observe whose displeasure you have heaped upon yourself; and if you are prosperous and successful, then you may denounce God and myself as liars before all the world.

We have now sufficiently admonished, warned, and advised. Any one who will neither regard nor believe these things, we shall permit to proceed until he is taught by experience. It is necessary, however, to impress these things on the minds of the young, so that they may be on their guard not to imitate the hardened and untractable multitude, but have in their view the commandment of God, in order that his wrath and punishment may not come upon them also. It pertains unto us to admonish and reprove through the Word of God; but it belongs to princes and magistrates to restrain such manifest injustice; who should have their eyes and their minds engaged in instituting and preserving regulations for all kinds of traffic and commerce, so that the poor be not burdened and oppressed, and they themselves be not loaded with the sins of others.

Let it suffice, then, as a definition of stealing, that the term be not confined to limits so contracted, but applied to all our dealings with our fellow man. And for the purpose of comprehending in a few words, as we have done in the preceding commandments, the meaning of this one, it is necessary to show that it forbids us, in the first place, to do our neighbor any injury and injustice, (no matter how many ways can be contrived to diminish his goods and chattels, or to retard or obstruct his interests,) or to allow or tolerate these things; but it enjoins on us to guard and protect him against injuries; and secondly, it commands us to improve and enhance his possessions, and where necessity requires it, to impart and extend our assistance, both to friends and foes.

Whoever, then, seeks and desires to do good works, finds abundant occasions to perform such as are acceptable and pleasing in the sight of God; and, moreover, he will be remunerated and overwhelmed with the richest blessings; so that whatever we do for the benefit and protection of our neighbor, shall be abundantly compensated, as king Solomon also teaches, Prov. 19, 17: "He that hath pity upon the poor lendeth unto the Lord; and that which he hath given will he pay him again." Here you have a bountiful Lord, who has indeed sufficient for you, and will not permit you to be in want, or to suffer; and thus you can enjoy, with cheerful conscience, infinitely more than you can accumulate by perfidy and injustice. Now, whoever does not desire these blessings, will find wrath and misfortune enough.

THE EIGHTH COMMANDMENT.

Thou shalt not bear false witness against thy neighbor.

Besides our bodies, our consort, and temporal property, we have another treasure still, namely, honor and reputation, with which we also cannot dispense. For it is intolerable for you to live among people, when you are oppressed with scandal, and scorned by all. For this reason it is equally as much opposed to the will of God that our neighbor's reputation, character, and honor should be assailed, as for his money and possessions to be diminished; but it is his will that each one should be respected by his wife, children, domestics, and neighbors. And in the first place, the most simple meaning of this commandment, as the words declare, *thou shalt not bear false witness*, has reference to a public court of justice, in which a poor innocent person is accused and oppressed by false evidence, through which he is punished in his person, property, and honor.

Now, this appears to have but little reference to us. But among the Jews this occurrence was exceedingly frequent and usual, notwithstanding the people were regulated by the best laws; and where such government still exists, there this sin prevails. The reason is this,—where a judge, mayor, prince, or other magistrate presides, it never fails, and it is according to the course of the world, that no one willingly desires to offend, but dissembles and speaks according to favors and interest, or friendship; for this reason a poor man must be defeated, and suffer injustice and punishment. And it is a common misfortune in the world, that pious persons scarcely ever sit in judgment; for it is above all things necessary for a judge to be a pious man—not only pious, but also wise and discreet, yes, shrewd and fearless; so it is also necessary that a witness should be fearless, yes, particularly a pious man. For he who should judge all matters equitably, and proceed properly with all decisions, will frequently offend friends, relations, neighbors, the rich and powerful, who can aid or injure him much. Therefore, he must be entirely blind, having his eyes and ears closed, and neither see nor hear any thing except the evidence brought before him, and decide according to that evidence.

First, this commandment accordingly tends to urge each one to assist his neighbor in sustaining his rights, not allowing them to be violated or infringed, but promoting and fearlessly defending them, whether it be judge or witness, no matter under what circumstances. And especially is there, in this place, a limit fixed for our honorable

jurists, in accordance to which they should see that civil matters are transacted rightfully and judiciously, in order to permit that which is just to remain just—not perverting it by concealment or silence—uninfluenced by money, property, honors, or power. This is one part of this commandment, and its plainest meaning, in reference to all that occurs in a court of justice.

Second, it comprehends much more, if we have reference to ecclesiastical jurisdiction or authority, in which it is frequently the case that some one bears false witness against his neighbor. For wherever pious preachers and Christians are found, they are judged before the world as heretics and apostates; yes, they are denounced as seditious, abandoned wretches; and besides, the Word of God must be persecuted, blasphemed, falsified, perverted, and erroneously quoted and explained, in the most shameful and virulent manner. But we shall pass over this for the present, since it is natural for the blind world to condemn and to persecute the truth and the children of God, without even regarding it as sinful.

Third, with respect to that which refers to all of us,—all sins of the tongue, by which we can injure or offend our neighbor, are forbidden in this commandment. For, bearing false witness is nothing less than the action of the lips; whatever we do, then, to the injury of our neighbor, by an act of our lips, God prohibits; whether it be done by false teachers, with perverse doctrines and blasphemies, or by iniquitous judges and witnesses, with false decisions, or by others who are not in authority, with the falsehood and virulence of their tongues. And to these especially belongs this most detestable vice of secret detraction or slander, with which Satan has so deeply infected us; concerning which a great deal might be said. For it is a pernicious and universal vice, that every one prefers hearing evil rather than good about his neighbor. And though we ourselves are so wicked that we cannot suffer any one to circulate an evil report concerning us, we all, however, ardently desire the whole world to applaud us in the most commending terms, and yet we are unwilling to hear any commendation concerning others.

Wherefore, in order to avoid this vice, let us consider that it is not allowed to any one to judge and reprove his neighbor publicly, even if he sees him sinning, unless he has authority to judge and to punish. For there is a great difference between these two phrases: *to judge sins*, and *to be conscious of sins*. We may indeed be aware of them, but we have no right to judge them. We can, evidently, see and hear that our neighbor has sinned, but we have no right to report it to others. When we proceed to judge and condemn an-

other, we commit a greater sin than he: if you know it, however, do nothing more than bury it in the secrecy of your own bosom, until you are commanded to judge and to punish by virtue of your office.

Those are secret calumniators or slanderers, who are not contented with a knowledge of an error, but assume to themselves judicial authority, and if aware of the slightest misdemeanor of another, they rumor it in every corner—scoffing and sneering for the purpose of exciting the derision of others, like swine wallowing in the mire. This is nothing else but presumptuously anticipating God in his judgment and office, judging and condemning with the severest acrimony. For no judge can punish more severely, nor go further than to declare that this one is a thief, a murderer, or a traitor. For this reason, whoever presumes to assert these things about his neighbor, usurps a power even as extensive as that of emperor and the whole government. For even if you do not wield the sword, you, notwithstanding, employ your virulent tongue to the reproach and injury of your neighbor.

For this reason God wishes to restrain us from speaking any evil of a fellow creature, even if he be guilty and we are conscious of it; much more if we are uncertain, and have received our information merely from report. But if you ask: “Shall I say nothing about it, when I know it to be true?” Why do you then not refer it to lawful judges? But you will say: “I am unable to sustain it by indubitable testimony, and I might, perhaps, subject myself to the danger of incurring punishment for a false accusation.” Well, beloved friend, if you dread the consequences, and do not trust to appear before authorized persons, and sustain the charge, say nothing about it; but if you know it to be true, know it for your own benefit, and not for that of another; for if you circulate it, even if it be true, you must still be regarded as a liar, because you are unable to make it appear true; and besides, you act like a wicked wretch, since no one has a right to speak injuriously of the honor and reputation of his fellow man, unless that honor and reputation have been already taken away from him by public authority.

Consequently every thing that cannot be established, as it should be, may be regarded as *false witness*. Wherefore, whatever is not manifest from sufficient testimony, no one should publish or relate as truth. And in a word, that which is secret should be left undivulged, or be reprovèd in private, as we shall hear. Wherever, therefore, a secret calumniator approaches you, and detracts from the character of another by slanderings him, reprovè him to his face,

that he may blush. By this means many might be put to silence, who would otherwise bring an innocent person into contempt, from which he could scarcely extricate himself. For it is easy to take away the honor and reputation of a man, but it is difficult for him to regain them.

Thus you perceive that we are strictly forbidden to publish any thing evil concerning our neighbor; but civil magistrates, ministers, and parents may do so, that this commandment be understood as not permitting evil to go unpunished. For according to the fifth commandment, we should not personally injure any one; but the executioner, by virtue of his office, should show the guilty no favors, but inflict punishments on them; which he may do without sinning against the command of God, because God has instituted this office on account of transgressors. For God reserves to himself the right of inflicting punishment according to his own will, as he threatens in the first commandment. And though no one, as an individual, should judge or condemn any one, yet if those do not, who are authorized, they sin indeed, as well as those who usurp that authority. For necessity requires an evil deed to be proclaimed, and submitted to examination and testimony. And this is carried into effect by means similar to those which a physician employs when about effecting a cure, by making at times, in private, the necessary examination and inspection with reference to his patient. Thus magistrates, fathers, and mothers, yes, even brothers and sisters, and other good friends, are under obligation to each other, to reprove vice when it is necessary and beneficial to do so.

But the proper method of restraining vice, would be to observe the order prescribed in the Gospel, Matt. 18, 15, where Christ says: "If thy brother shall trespass against thee, go tell him his fault between thee and him alone." Here you have a precious and a noble doctrine, worthy of diligent observance, cautiously directing your influence against this detestable abuse. Direct your conduct, then, according to it, in order that you may not so unreservedly detract from the character of your fellow man, and calumniate him; but privately admonish him to reform. And pursue a similar course when any one whispers in your ear the errors of which this or that individual is guilty: advise him to go and reprove these offences, if they have fallen under his observation, and if not, to remain silent.

This you may learn from the administration of daily family government. For this is the method pursued by the father of a family,—seeing a servant neglecting the performance of his duty, he reproofs that servant. But were he so imprudent as to leave his ser-

vant at home, and to go forth upon the streets for the purpose of uttering complaints to his neighbors against him, he undoubtedly would have to hear this declaration: "Thou fool, what does it concern us? Why do you not reprove him yourself?" If he were to observe this advice, he would act in a very brotherly manner, so that the evil might be amended, and his servant sustain his honor and reputation; as Christ himself also says: "If he shall hear thee, thou hast gained thy brother," Matt. 18, 15. Here you might achieve a great and memorable deed. Or do you consider it a small thing to gain a brother? Let all the monks and holy orders come forward with all their works combined, and we shall see whether they are able to claim the honor of having gained a brother.

Christ further teaches: "If he will not hear thee, then take with thee one or two more, that in the mouth of two or three witnesses every word may be established," verse 16. Consequently, we should confer with the individual himself, whom it concerns, and not back-bite him; but if this course avail nothing, then present it publicly to the proper tribunal, whether civil or ecclesiastical. For in this case you are not alone, but in connection with those witnesses, by whom you are able to convict the accused, and upon whose testimony the judge can rely, decide, and inflict punishment. In this way we are able to attain the object in a regular and proper manner, restraining the evil or amending it. Otherwise, if you defame another by detraction, stirring up his misdeeds, no bad habits will be amended; and afterwards, when you must appear and testify, you will deny that it was said by you. It would therefore be serving these detractors justly, to wound the intemperance of their tongues severely, so that the desires of others for slander might be checked by it. For if those things were circulated by you, for the improvement of your fellow man, acting through the love of truth, you would not skulk around privately, avoiding the day and the light.

All these things are said with respect to secret sins. But when the sin is so distinctly evident that it is known by the judge and every one else, you may, without committing sin in any respect, avoid and discard the perpetrator as one who has exposed himself to shame; and you may also bear witness against him openly. For there can be no scandal, false evidence, nor injustice, in speaking of that which is clearly evident. Even as at present, we censure the doctrine of the Pope, which appears publicly in print, and which is proclaimed throughout the world. For if the sin is public, public

reproof should also follow, so that each one may know how to guard himself against it.

Thus we now have the substance and general meaning of this commandment,—that no one should injure his fellow man by the detractive malignity of his tongue, whether friend or foe, nor speak evil of him, whether it be true or untrue, if it be not done by commandment, or for his benefit and edification; but he should employ his tongue profitably, and speak the best of every one, covering over the sins and imperfections of his neighbor, excusing, and protecting him in every honorable way. To this, however, we should be incited, chiefly by the motive which Christ indicates in the Gospel, and in which he would have comprised all the commandments relating to neighbors: “All things whatsoever ye would that men should do to you, do ye even so to them,” Matt. 7, 12.

We are also taught these things by nature itself, in our own bodies, as St. Paul, 1 Cor. 12, 22, 23, says: “Nay, much more those members of the body which seem to be more feeble, are necessary. And those members of the body which we think to be less honorable, upon these we bestow more abundant honor; and our uncomely parts have more abundant comeliness.” The face, the eyes, the nose, and mouth, no one conceals, for they have no need of it, being in themselves the most honorable members which we have; but the most uncomely, of which we are ashamed if they should be exposed, we conceal with the greatest care; which our hands and our eyes, together with our whole body, are occupied in covering and veiling. So we should also act among each other, palliating whatever is dishonorable and defective in our neighbor, making every effort within our power to conduce to his honor, improving and promoting it. And, again, we should restrain whatever might result in his dishonor. And particularly is it an amiable and a noble virtue in him who is able to put the best construction upon all (excepting that which is evidently wicked) that he hears said about his neighbor, or to defend it in the most efficient manner, against the virulent tongues, which busy themselves whenever they can search out or discover any thing, in censuring their fellow man, and in the most malignant manner, proclaiming and perverting it; as it happens at the present time, especially with the precious Word of God and his ministers.

Therefore, in this commandment very many good works are comprehended, which are in the highest degree pleasing in the sight of God, and bring with themselves superabundant blessings and favors, if the blind world and the false saints would only perceive them. For there is nothing in, nor belonging to the entire man, which, in

a greater degree and to a wider extent, can both accomplish good and effect evil, in spiritual as well as in civil matters, than the tongue, although it is the smallest and the feeblest member.

THE NINTH AND TENTH COMMANDMENTS.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's house.

Thou shalt not covet thy neighbor's wife, nor his man-servant, nor his maid-servant, nor his ox, nor his ass, nor any thing that is thy neighbor's.

These two commandments were given almost exclusively to the Jews, although they are partly applicable to us. For they do not explain them as referring to unchastity or theft, since these are sufficiently forbidden in the foregoing commandments; and they also held that they had observed all those commandments, if they had performed externally the works enjoined, or if they had abstained from those forbidden. For this reason God added these two commandments, that to covet our neighbor's wife or possessions, or to attempt to obtain them in any way, might also be considered sinful and forbidden; and especially, since under the Jewish government servants were not like our hirelings at present, at liberty to serve for wages as long as they pleased, but they were the property of their masters, with their bodies and whatever they had, like cattle and other property. And besides this, the Jews also had power over their wives to put them away publicly, through a writing of divorcement, and to take another. Under these circumstances they were necessarily exposed to the danger, if any one desired to have the wife of another, of his taking occasion, by some means, both to put away his own wife, and to alienate the wife of another, in order that he might obtain her under the appearance of justice. Among them this was not considered either a sin or a disgrace, as little as it now is when a father of a family discharges a servant, or when one alienates the servant of another.

Therefore they, I say, thus explained these commandments, and correctly too, (though they are somewhat more comprehensive,) that no one should presume and endeavor to obtain the possessions of another—his wife, for instance, his domestics, house and home, lands, or cattle—even with a good appearance and pretext of justice, yet with injury to his neighbor. For in the seventh commandment, the guilt of so seizing upon the property of another, or of withholding from our neighbor that to which we can have no right, is forbid-

den. But here it is also forbidden to take away any thing from our neighbor, even if we are able to obtain it honorably in the sight of the world, so that no one may dare to impeach or to censure us with having acquired it through unjust means.

For we are so inclined by nature, that no one desires another to be as successful as himself, and every one accumulates as much as he can, no matter what the condition of his neighbor may be. And still we wish to be regarded as pious, putting on the best appearance, and concealing the imposture; we seek after and devise ingenious artifices and crafty schemes, (which are now daily contrived with consummate skill,) as though they were sanctioned by law; and boasting, we boldly appeal to these; and we wish them to be called, not deceptions or frauds, but sagacity and prudence. And all these are suffered by jurists and judges, who distort and extend the law by forced constructions, in whatever manner it may seem to apply to the case, perverting and evading the words, regardless of justice and the necessities of their fellow man. And in a word, he who is the most ingenious and expert in these things, is most favored by the laws, as they also say: *vigilantibus jura subreniunt*—the laws favor the watchful.

This last commandment is, therefore, not given for knaves, abandoned in the sight of the world, but particularly for those who wish to appear the most pious, and seek applause, desiring to be esteemed honorable and blameless, having in no wise transgressed the preceding commandments; as the Jews especially, and many great noblemen, lords, and princes, desire to be called at the present day. For the common mass of people are embraced in the seventh commandment,—which is of a more general import,—who are but little concerned how they may obtain their possessions with honor and justice.

Thus these things occur mostly in litigations, in which persons determine to gain something from their neighbor, and to deprive him of his just rights. For instance, when a person contends for a large legacy, permanent property, &c., he avails himself of those means which seem to have an appearance of justice, he so embellishes his cause with a display of words, that the court must favor it, and he holds the property by such a title, that no one is able to lay claim to it. Moreover, when one desires to occupy a castle, town, an earldom, or something else of great value, he has recourse to so many schemes, that through the instrumentality of his friends, and whatever other means he is able to employ, the occupant being driven away, the possession is adjudged to him: and besides, it is confirmed by seal

and signature, so that it may be said that he gained it with honesty and the title of a prince.

Similar practices are also carried on in common traffic and contracts, in which one, through grasping cupidity, defrauds another, so that the latter must be perpetually on his guard, or be deceived and defrauded; and the one who has been defrauded, may probably, on account of pressing necessity or debt, not be able to retain his property, or to redeem it without sustaining serious injury, so that the other one obtains it for half or less than half of its value. And yet this is not considered as taking unjustly or stealing, but as buying honorably. According to the common saying, "Let the first be the best—let each one watch his own interest, regardless of the condition of another." And who would be skilful and ingenious enough to think of all the ways in which wealth may be accumulated under this appearance of justice, and which the world does not consider unjust? Nor will it see that by this means our fellow man is injured, and must be deprived of these things, the want of which he cannot bear without pain; when at the same time there is no one who desires such practices to be exercised towards himself; from which it is easy to perceive that this kind of evasion and pretext is false.

A similar course was pursued with respect to women among the ancients; for they could invent such artifices, that when one was pleased with the wife of another, he would within himself or through the instrumentality of others, (as there were various ways and means which could be devised,) induce her husband to become displeased with her, or cause her to resist him, or so conduct herself that he must put her away, and permit this one to have her. This doubtless prevailed very much among the Jews, as we also read in the Gospel, concerning king Herod, that he married his own brother's wife, even whilst his brother was yet living, who, nevertheless, wished to be an honorable, pious man, as St. Mark testifies, Mark 6, 20. But such examples, I trust will not occur among us, since in the New Testament, those joined in matrimony, are forbidden to separate,—unless it were in a case, where one, by some stratagem, takes away the rich bride of another. But among us, however, it is not a rare thing for one to alienate the servant or handmaid of another, or otherwise to lead her away by the persuasion of flattering words.

Now, let all these things happen as they may, we should know that it is not the will of God that you should take away any thing from your neighbor, which belongs to him, so as to reduce him to want, in order to satiate your avaricious desires, even if you can hold

it honorably in the sight of the world. For it is an insidious deception, practised under a false coloring, to prevent it from being detected. For even if you act as if you had done no one injustice, you have still encroached on your neighbor's rights, and if it is not called stealing or cheating, it is, at least, coveting the property of your fellow man: that is, striving after it, taking from him without his consent, and envying him for that which God has bestowed upon him. And even if the judge and every one must allow it to you, yet God will not; for he truly perceives the deception of the heart and the cupidity of the world, which, if we grant it a finger's breadth, will take the length of an ell, so that finally manifest injustice and violence must result.

We, therefore, understand these commandments according to their common meaning:—First, that they forbid us to wish our neighbor any injury, or to assist or to be instrumental in injuring him; but on the other hand, they require us willingly to allow him whatever justly belongs to him, and to favor him in the enjoyment of it; moreover, to promote whatever may contribute to his interest and advantage, and to defend the same, as we would that others should do unto us. And consequently, they are particularly given in opposition to envy and insatiable avarice, in order that God may remove the cause and the source from which all the evils spring, through which our neighbor is injured. For this reason he has plainly expressed them with these words: "Thou shalt not covet," &c. For he especially desires to have the heart pure, although we cannot attain this purity while this life endures: so that these, indeed, as well as all others, remain commandments, which continually accuse us, and indicate how impious we are in the sight of God.

CONCLUSION OF THE TEN COMMANDMENTS.

Thus we have the Ten Commandments, the essence of the divine doctrine, showing what we should observe in order that our whole lives may be acceptable in the sight of God; and moreover, the true fountain and source, from which must spring and into which must return, all works which are to be considered good; so that without the Ten Commandments no work nor course of conduct can be good and pleasing in the sight of God, let it be as great and as precious in the sight of the world as it may. Now, let us see what our great and notable saints are able to boast of, concerning their spiritual orders and their great and difficult works which they have devised and established, omitting those embraced in the Decalogue, as if they

were much too insignificant, or as if they had been long since accomplished. I am indeed of the opinion, that we would all find enough here to engage our utmost endeavors in observing lenity, patience, and love towards enemies, chastity, benevolence, &c., and all that is connected with these virtues. But works of this kind have no charm and beauty in the eyes of the world. For they are not rare and brilliant, nor confined to certain particular times, places, modes, and customs; but they are common, daily, domestic duties, which one neighbor is able to perform towards another; therefore they have no respectability or reputation.

But the former works excite the curiosity and attention of men, being promoted by the most pompous ceremonies, great expenses, and royal edifices; and they are so decorated that all things must appear brilliant and splendid;—here they burn incense; here they sing and tinkle: here they light up tapers; so that on account of these things nothing else can be heard or seen. For the appearance of a priest in a surplice decorated with gold, or the position of a layman during the whole day, in the church on his knees, is called a precious work, which no one is able to extol sufficiently; but the diligent attention of a poor little girl to an infant, and the faithful performance of that which is commanded her, must be regarded as nothing. What else should monks and nuns seek in their cloisters?

But observe, is this not an execrable presumption of those desperate saints? who pretend to discover orders and a course of life, better and more sublime than those taught in the Ten Commandments; affirming, as already said, that this is merely an ordinary course of life, for the observance of common persons; but that theirs is proposed for the saints and for the perfect. Nor do these poor blind persons see that no man is able to arrive at such a state of perfection, as will enable him to keep one of the Ten Commandments as it should be kept, but that it is still necessary for faith and the Lord's Prayer to come to our assistance, (as we shall hear,) through which we seek and implore, and continually receive this grace and virtue. Their glorying is therefore not otherwise than if one should boast and say: "It is true I have not a farthing with which to pay, but I hope easily to pay ten guilders."

I insist upon these things in order that we may once be liberated from this miserable abuse, which has so deeply taken root, and which still adheres to every one; and in order that we accustom ourselves to have our eyes intent upon these things alone, in every condition of life on earth, and to be solicitous about them. For no doctrine or discipline will ever be produced which will be equal to the Ten

Commandments, since they propose a character so exalted, that no one is able through the powers of man, to attain it; and whoever attains it, is a heavenly, angelic being, far superior to all the sanctity of the world. Take these commandments into consideration, then, and use every exertion, devoting all your power and energy to them, and you will find so much to perform, indeed, that you will neither seek nor esteem any other works. Let this suffice, in reference to the first part of the common Christian doctrine, being considered at sufficient length, both for instruction and admonition; yet in conclusion, we must repeat the text which belongs here, and which we have also spoken of before, in the first commandment, in order that we learn how much importance God wishes to have attached to them, so that we may diligently learn to inculcate and practise the Ten Commandments.

I the Lord thy God am a jealous God, visiting the iniquity of the fathers upon the children unto the third and fourth generation of them that hate me; and showing mercy unto thousands of them that love me and keep my commandments.

Although this Declaration as we have already heard, is annexed to the first commandment, yet it was laid down for the sake of all of them, since they should conjointly be referred and directed to it. For this reason I have said that it should be held forth to youth, and be impressed upon their minds, so that they may learn and retain it, in order that they may see what should urge and constrain us to observe these Ten Commandments; and we should not regard it in any other light, than that it is joined with each one in particular, so that it pertains and relates to all of them.

Now, as we have already said, there are both a terrible menace and a gracious promise embraced in these words, for the purpose of terrifying and warning, and moreover, of alluring and inciting us, in order that we may receive God's Word in holy sincerity, since he himself expresses how much depends upon it, and how inflexibly he will insist upon it, namely: that he will severely and terribly punish all who scorn and transgress his commandments; and again, how abundantly he will reward, favor, and bless with every kind of beneficence, those who greatly esteem them, and cheerfully act and live according to them. By this means he requires that all should proceed from a heart which fears God alone, and keeps him ever present to its thoughts through such fear, abstaining from all that is contrary to his will, so as not to provoke him; and, on the other hand, which trusts in him alone, and performs, through love to him, that

which he desires, since he permits himself to be heard as affectionately as a father, and offers unto all favors and blessings.

And in like manner the true meaning and the proper explanation of the first and principal commandment, from which all others should spring and proceed, is nothing else but that which these words—*Thou shalt have no other gods*—express in the simplest terms, as required here: thou shalt fear and love me as thine own true God, and trust in me; for whatever heart is thus inclined towards God, has fulfilled this and all other commandments. And again, whoever fears and loves any thing else either in heaven or on earth, observes neither this nor any other commandment. Therefore, the whole Scripture has every where enforced and inculcated this commandment, directing all things upon these two,—fear and confidence in God; and especially does the psalmist David teach it throughout the Psalms; for instance, where he says: “The Lord taketh pleasure in them that fear him, in those that hope in his mercy,” Psalm 147, 11,—explaining this commandment in one verse, and implying even thus much: the Lord taketh pleasure in those who have no other gods.

Let the first commandment, then, illuminate the whole; let it diffuse its radiance over the rest; and let the Declaration attached to the first commandment, unite and hold them all together in bright harmony, like a wreath of flowers on a circular band, which the eye may continue to pass over repeatedly, without forgetting a single flower. For instance, we are taught in the second commandment to fear God, and not to misuse his name in swearing, lying, cheating, or in other deceptive and dishonorable practices, but to use it properly and truthfully in supplication, prayer, praise, and giving of thanks, through the love and confidence resulting from the first commandment. And in like manner we should be incited by this fear, confidence, and love, not to scorn his Word, but to hear and learn it cheerfully, to honor it, and to hold it sacred.

And it extends, moreover, through the succeeding commandments, all of which are to be observed towards our neighbor by virtue of the first commandment; so that we may honor our father and our mother, our superiors, and all who are in authority, and be subservient and obedient, not on account of their will, but on account of the will of God. And you should not be urged to the performance or the neglect of any of these duties, merely in consideration of your parents, or through fear or love towards them; but you should especially observe that which God desires, and which he will very strictly require of you: if you neglect it, you incur the dis-

pleasure of a wrathful Judge, or if, on the other hand, you observe it, you secure a benevolent Father.

Again, that you do your fellow man no injury or violence, nor encroach upon his rights in any respect, whether it be in reference to his own body, or to his wife, or to his property, or to his honor, or to his just claims, as these are commanded in their order, even if you might have room and occasion for it, and if no one would reprove you for it; but that you do good unto all, helping and promoting them whenever and in whatever respect you can, through love and gratitude to God alone, in full confidence that he will abundantly reward you for it all. Thus you see then, how the first commandment is the head or fountain, which passes through all the others, and to which they all return and cleave; so that the end and the beginning are indissolubly united and bound up in each other.

It is useful and necessary, I say then, to present these things continually to the young, and to urge and impress them on their minds, in order that they may be reared up, not merely by constraint and through fear of the rod, like beasts, but in the fear and honor of God. For they themselves will be spontaneously moved and urged to perform the will of God with cheerfulness, if they seriously consider and cordially reflect, that these are not the idle talk of men, but the commandments of that Divine Being, who so seriously enjoins them, and who punishes those who scorn them, pouring out his wrath over them; but on the other hand, remunerating those who observe them, with inestimable blessings. Therefore it was commanded in the Old Testament, not without reason, that the Ten Commandments should be written on all the walls and every corner, yes, even upon their garments, not merely for the purpose of standing written there, and of being carried about as a spectacle, as the Jews did, but to be perpetually before our eyes, and continually in our memory, in all our business and actions. And let each one permit them to be his daily exercise, in all circumstances, occupations, and dealings, as if they were standing written on every place at which he directs his eyes, yes, wherever he stands or goes. Thus we would find sufficient cause to practise the Ten Commandments, both for ourselves at home, and towards our neighbors, so that no one would need to go far to find a cause.

Now, from all this we can easily perceive how highly these Ten Commandments should be exalted and extolled, above all orders, commands, and works, which men otherwise teach and exercise. For here we can boast and say: let all the wise and the saints come forward, and see whether they are able to produce a single work

equal to any of those which are required in these commandments, and which God so solemnly demands, and enjoins with his most terrible threatenings of punishment, and adding, besides, a most glorious promise, that he will shower down on us every blessing and all the comforts of life. We should, therefore, teach them in preference to all others, holding them high and precious in our estimation, as the noblest treasure given of God.

PART II.

OF THE CREED.

Hitherto we have heard the first part of the Christian doctrine, and learned all that God wishes us to perform, and all from which he desires us to abstain. Here then, the doctrine of Faith properly follows, which presents to us all that we must expect and receive from God; and to speak briefly, it teaches us to acknowledge him wholly and entirely. The province of this faith is to enable us to perform that which is required of us in the Ten Commandments; for they are, as we have stated above, so sublime and lofty in their institution, that all the powers of man are far too low and feeble to observe them. It is as necessary, therefore, to teach this part, as it is to teach the former, in order that we may know how to observe the Commandments, and from what source and through what means this power is to be derived. For if we were able to keep them by our own powers, as they should be kept, we would have no need of any thing further, neither the Creed, nor the Lord's Prayer. But before we proceed to explain these benefits, and the necessity of the Creed, it is sufficient, first, for those who are entirely inexperienced, to learn to comprehend and understand the Creed in itself.

Heretofore, the Creed was divided into twelve articles; and yet there are a great many more articles, should we distinguish all the particulars separately which are contained in the Scriptures, and which pertain to the Creed, nor could they be distinctly defined with so few words. But, in order that the Creed may be comprehended in the easiest and most simple manner, as it is to be taught to children, it shall be comprised briefly in three chief articles, according to the three persons of the Trinity; and to these articles all that we

believe is referred : so that the first article, concerning God the Father, explains creation ; the second, concerning the Son, explains redemption ; the third, concerning the Holy Spirit, explains sanctification. As if the Creed were briefly comprised in so many words : I believe in God the Father, who has created me ; I believe in God the Son, who has redeemed me ; I believe in the Holy Spirit, who sanctifies me. One God and one faith, but three persons ; therefore, also three articles or confessions. Thus we shall now briefly consider the words of the Creed.

ARTICLE I.

I believe in God the Father, Almighty Maker of heaven and earth.

Here we have a compendious exhibition of the character, will, and works of God, the Father. For, since the Ten Commandments teach that we should not have more than one God, the question might then arise : What kind of a being is this God ? what does he do ? how can he be praised, or defined and described, so as to be known ? This the following article teaches ; so that the Creed is nothing but an answer and a confession of Christians, founded on the first commandment. As when we ask a child : Beloved, what kind of God have you ?—what do you know about him ?—that it can reply : This is my God, first, the Father who has created the heaven and the earth ; I hold nothing else as God, but this one alone ; for there is no one else who could create heaven and earth.

But for the learned, and those who have made some proficiency in the knowledge of the Scriptures, we might expatiate upon each of these three articles, and divide them into as many parts as there are words. For young pupils, however, it is sufficient, at present, to notice the most important points, namely, as we have stated, that this article pertains to creation, and that we rely upon the words : *Creator of heaven and earth*. What then is implied, or what do you understand by the words, *I believe in God the Father, Almighty Maker, &c.* ? Answer :—I mean and believe that I am a creature of God ; that is, that he has given me, and continually preserves my body, soul, and life, and all my members ; my senses, reason, and understanding, and the like ; meat and drink, raiment and sustenance, wife and children, domestics, house and residence, &c. ; and besides, that he permits all creatures to contribute to the benefits and necessities of life—the sun, the moon, and the stars in the firmament ; day and night : air, fire, water, earth, and whatever these produce

and are able to bring forth—fowls, fish, animals, grain, and all kinds of growth; and moreover, all other bodily and temporal blessings—good government, peace, security, &c. So that we learn from this article, that no one of us possesses life, or any of those blessings which we have just enumerated, or which may be hereafter mentioned, of himself; and that he is unable to preserve any of them, no matter how small and insignificant it may be; for all are comprehended in this word *Maker*.

We also confess, moreover, that God the Father has not only given us all those things which we have and behold; but that he also protects and defends us daily against every evil and distress, and averts all kinds of danger and misfortune. And all this he does, unmerited by us, through pure love and goodness, like an affectionate father, who takes care of us, so that no evil befall us. A further consideration, however, of these things pertains to the other two parts of this article, where we say, *Father, Almighty*.

Hence it is easy to infer, and it naturally follows—since God daily gives, sustains, and preserves all that we possess, together with all that is in heaven and on earth—that we are under obligation to love, to praise, and to thank him continually, and in a word, thus to serve him wholly and entirely, as he requires and orders in the Ten Commandments. Here there would be a great deal to say, if any one should describe how few there are who believe this article. For we all pass over it superficially, hearing and repeating it, but we do not see and consider what the words convey to us. For if we believed it sincerely, we would also act according to it, and not so haughtily pass along with insolent presumption, as if we possessed life, wealth, power, honors, &c., of ourselves, that others might fear and serve us, as the unhappy, perverted world is accustomed to do, which, beclouded in its own blindness, misuses all the gifts and blessings of God in its arrogance, avarice, voluptuousness, and disgraceful pleasures alone, without once looking up to God for the purpose of returning thanks to him, or of acknowledging him as Lord and Creator.

For this reason we all should be humbled and awed by this article, if we truly believe it. For we daily commit sins with our eyes, our ears, and hands; with our bodies and souls; with our money and property, and with all that we have; especially those who war against the Word of God; yet Christians, however, have this advantage, that they acknowledge themselves to be under obligation to serve and obey him for the blessings conferred on them.

Wherefore, this article should be daily exercised and impressed on

our minds, and repeated in our memories in all that presents itself to our eyes and occurs to us; and when we have been rescued from dangers and difficulties,—as this is wholly the work and blessing of God,—that we may thereby perceive and learn his fatherly affection and superabundant love towards us. By this our hearts would be warmed and animated with thankfulness, and induced to use all these blessings to the honor and glory of God. Thus we have this article in the most compendious form, so far as it is necessary for the inexperienced to learn at first, both as to what we have and receive from God, and what we are under obligation to do; a knowledge almost unlimited; a treasure of inestimable value. For here we see how the Father has given himself unto us, with all creatures, and provides for us in this life, in the most bountiful manner; and besides, as we shall hear, he showers us over with ineffable and eternal blessings, through his Son and Holy Spirit.

ARTICLE II.

And in Jesus Christ, his only Son, our Lord, who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary, suffered under Pontius Pilate, was crucified, died, and was buried. He descended into hell; on the third day he rose again from the dead; he ascended into heaven, and sits at the right hand of God, the Father Almighty, from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead.

Here we learn to know the second person of the Trinity, and we perceive what we derive from God besides the temporal blessings mentioned above; namely, how he has poured himself out wholly and entirely, and reserved nothing. Now this article is very full and comprehensive; but in order that we may discuss it also in a brief and simple manner, we shall take up before us a single word, and comprise in it the whole sum and substance of the article, namely, as we have stated, that we may learn how we are redeemed; and we should rely on these words: *In Jesus Christ our Lord.*

Now, when it is asked, What do you believe in the second article, concerning Jesus Christ? reply briefly: I believe that Jesus Christ, the true Son of God, became my Lord. What is meant, then, by becoming Lord? It is this, that he has redeemed me from sin, from Satan, from death, and from all misfortune. For before this I had no Lord, nor King; but I was enfeathered by the power of Satan, condemned to death, and entangled in sin and blindness.

For when we were first created, and when we had received ines-

156 } timable blessings from God the Father, the devil came, envious of our felicity, and drew us, by his craft, into disobedience, sin, and every kind of misfortune, so that we lay under the wrath and displeasure of God, consigned to eternal punishment, as we deserved and merited. Here there was neither counsel, nor help, nor consolation, until this only and eternal Son of God, moved by the impulses of fathomless goodness, commiserated us in our deplorable and miserable condition, and descended from heaven to help us. Thus, then, the powers of those tyrants and oppressors are put to flight and suppressed, and Jesus Christ has succeeded in their stead—the Lord of life, of righteousness, of every good, and of salvation; has rescued us poor lost creatures out of the jaws of hell, gained and liberated us, restored us into the favor and grace of the Father, and received us as his own property, into his care and protection, that he may direct us through his righteousness, wisdom, power, life, and salvation.

Therefore the sum of this article is, that the word *Lord* signifies, in its most simple meaning, as much as Redeemer, that is, the one who has brought us from Satan to God—from death to life—from sin to righteousness, and thus preserves us. The parts, however, which succeed each other in this article, chiefly serve to illustrate and explain this redemption—how and through what means it came to pass; that is, how dear and precious a price it cost Christ, what he bestowed upon it, what he hazarded to gain us and to bring us into his kingdom; namely, he became man, was begotten by the Holy Ghost, and born of the Virgin Mary, free from all sins, in order that he might be the lord of sin; moreover, he suffered, died, and was buried, that he might make expiation for me, and make compensation for my transgressions, not with gold or silver, but with his own precious blood. And all this he did, that he might be my Lord; he performed nothing for himself, nor had he need of any thing. Afterwards he arose from the dead, and overcame death: and finally, he ascended to heaven, and received dominion at the right hand of the Father, that the devil and all powers might be subject to him, and lie beneath his feet, until he, ultimately on the last day, shall separate and remove us from this wicked world, from Satan, death, and sin.

But to treat each of these particulars separately, does not comport with a brief lecture for children; it rather belongs to the more lengthy sermons throughout the year, especially at the times set apart for the purpose of treating each article at proper length, concerning the nativity, passion, resurrection, and ascension of Christ. Moreover,

the entire Gospel which we preach, depends also on this, that we properly embrace this article, since our whole redemption and salvation are based upon it, and since it is so abundant and copious, that we always have enough to learn in it.

ARTICLE III.

I believe in the Holy Ghost, in a holy Christian church, the communion of saints, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and life everlasting. Amen.

I am unable to express this article, concerning *sanctification*, in better terms, (as we have already stated,) than simply to say, that by it the office of the Holy Ghost is indicated and described, namely, that his province is to sanctify. We must insist, therefore, that the term *Holy Spirit* is the most expressive that can be employed. For there are various spirits made mention of in the Scriptures; as for instance, human spirits, heavenly spirits, and evil spirits; but the Spirit of God alone is called Holy Spirit; that is, who has sanctified us and still sanctifies. For as the Father is called Creator, the Son Redeemer, so also should the Holy Spirit, on account of his office, be called a Sanctifier, or one who sanctifies. But how is this sanctification accomplished? Reply:—In the same manner as the Son obtains dominion, by gaining us through his nativity, death, resurrection, &c., the Holy Spirit accomplishes this sanctification, through the following means, namely, through the communion of saints or the Christian church, the remission of sins, the resurrection of the body, and eternal life; that is, he first leads us into his holy communion, and lays us in the bosom of the church, through which he teaches us and leads us to Christ.

For neither I nor you could ever know any thing of Christ or believe in him, and approach the Lord, if it were not offered and freely given to us through the preaching of the Gospel by the Holy Ghost, through whom this work is performed and accomplished; for Christ gained and obtained this treasure by his suffering, death, and resurrection. But if it should remain in obscurity, unknown to any one, it would be vain and utterly lost. But in order that this treasure might not remain buried in obscurity, but that it might be applied and enjoyed, God sent forth his Word to be preached and revealed to all; in which Word the Holy Ghost is given to bring home unto us this treasure, this redemption, and to appropriate it to us. Wherefore, this act of sanctification is nothing else but bringing us

to Christ the Lord, for the purpose of receiving this blessing, to which we are unable to arrive by our own powers.

Learn, then, to understand this article in the clearest manner, so that when you are asked what you understand by the words, *I believe in the Holy Ghost*, you can answer: I believe that the Holy Ghost sanctifies or makes me holy, as the name implies. But by what means does he do this? or what is the method and medium employed in accomplishing it? Answer:—Through the Christian church, the forgiveness of sins, the resurrection of the body, and eternal life. For in the first place, he has his own church in the world, which is the mother that bears and nourishes every Christian through the Word of God, which the Holy Ghost reveals and enforces,—animating and enlightening the hearts of men, so that they may comprehend and embrace it, adhere and cleave to it.

For if he does not have it preached, and awaken it in the heart, so as to be understood, it is of no avail, as was the case under the Papacy, where faith was wholly suppressed, and no one acknowledged Christ as Lord, or the Holy Ghost as the Power that sanctifies; that is, no one believed Christ to be that Lord who obtained this treasure for us, and reconciled us to the Father, without our works and merits. Wherein was the deficiency? In this, that the Holy Ghost, who might have revealed and preached these things, was absent; but human and evil spirits attended, who taught us to obtain grace and to be saved through our works. It was, therefore, no Christian church; for wherever Christ is not preached, there is no Holy Ghost constituting and assembling the Christian church, without whom no one can come to Christ the Lord. Let this suffice, then, concerning the sum and substance of this article; since, however, the parts enumerated in it, are not altogether clear to the inexperienced, we shall also consider them.

The Creed calls the holy Christian church *Communione Sanctorum*, a communion of saints,—terms perfectly equivalent. But formerly the latter clause was not employed; and it is also unhappily and unintelligibly rendered in German *eine Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, a communion of saints. If we should render it clearly, we must express it quite differently according to the German idiom; for the Greek word *Ecclesia* signifies strictly an assembly; but we are accustomed to the little word *Kirche*, church, which the illiterate do not understand as referring to an assembled multitude, but to the consecrated house or edifice; however, the sacred house should not be called a church, unless because a multitude of persons convene in it. For we who assemble, make and assign for ourselves a particu-

lar place, and designate the house by the name of the multitude.

Thus the little word *Kirche*, church, properly signifies nothing else but a common assembly; and it is not of German, but of Greek origin (as also the word *ecclesia*); for they call it in their language *ἐκκλησία*, as it is called also in Latin *curia*. It should therefore be called *eine Christliche Gemeinde oder Sammlung*, a Christian community or congregation, or most appropriately and clearly, *eine heilige Christenheit*, a holy Christianity.

Wherefore, also the word *communio*, which is attached, should be interpreted, not *Gemeinschaft*, communion, but *Gemeinde*, community. And this is nothing else but a definition by which some one wished to explain what the Christian church is. That word some among us, unacquainted both with the German and the Latin language, rendered *Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, communion of saints, when at the same time no dialect of the German is thus spoken or understood. But to speak proper German, it should be called *eine Gemeinde der Heiligen*, a community of saints, that is, a community in which there are pure saints; or still more clearly, *eine heilige Gemeinde*, a holy community. These remarks I make, in order that the words *Gemeinschaft der Heiligen*, communion of saints, may be understood; for, since they have thus obtained currency, it would be difficult to abolish them; and, on the other hand, to change a word, would instantly be branded with heresy.

The following, however, is the true import of the words which were added,—*Communion of saints*: I believe that there is a holy congregation and community on earth, of pure saints, under one head Christ, called together through the Holy Ghost, in one faith, mind, and understanding, with various gifts—yet concordant in love, free of heresy and dissension. I also believe that I am a part and a member of these, a participant and copartner of all the blessings which they have,—brought in and incorporated with them, by the Holy Ghost, through my having heard, and still continuing to hear the Word of God,—which is the first step towards entering into this community. For before we had come to this, we were entirely the subjects of Satan, as those who knew nothing of God and Christ. Thus until the last day, the Holy Ghost will remain with this holy community or Christian church, through which he persuades us, and which he uses for the purpose of promulgating and exercising the Word; by which he effects sanctification, extending the church, so that it daily increases, and becomes stronger in faith and the fruits which he produces.

We, moreover, further believe that in this Christian church we have forgiveness of sins; which takes place through the holy sacraments and absolution, and besides, through all consolatory passages of the whole Gospel. All, therefore, that is to be taught concerning the sacraments; in short, the whole Gospel, and all the offices of the Christian church, which are also necessary to be exercised continually, here find their application. For, although the grace of God is obtained through Christ, and sanctification is wrought by the Holy Ghost, through the Word of God in the unity of the Christian church; yet we are never free from sin, in consequence of our flesh, with which we are still encumbered.

All things in the Christian church, therefore, are so arranged that we may daily obtain full remission of sins through the Word and the signs, instituted for the purpose of consoling and elevating our consciences, while we continue in this life. Thus the Holy Ghost procures this happy end for us that, even if we are contaminated with sins, they still cannot injure us, since we are in the Christian church; in which there is full remission of sins, both because God forgives us, and because we forgive one another, mutually bearing with each other, and assisting one another. Out of the Christian church, however, where the Gospel does not exert its influence, there is no forgiveness of sins, and, consequently, there can be no holiness. Therefore, all those have separated and excluded themselves from this church, who wish to seek and merit holiness, not through the Gospel and the remission of sins, but through their own works.

But inasmuch as sanctification is commenced, and daily increases, we are awaiting the time when our flesh shall have perished, with all its imperfections, and when it shall have been raised again in complete holiness, in a new and eternal life. For now we exist only partially pure and holy; and it is necessary for the Holy Ghost continually to operate on us through the Word, and daily to impart forgiveness, till we, in a future life, in which there will be no more forgiveness, but completely and entirely pure and holy persons full of piety and righteousness, removed and freed from sin, death, and every misfortune, shall enjoy a new, immortal, and glorious life.

Behold, all this is the office and work of the Holy Ghost, who begins our sanctification here upon earth, and daily increases it by these two agencies,—*the Christian church, and forgiveness of sins.* But when we shall pass into the future life, in the twinkling of an eye, he will perfect it *by the resurrection of the body and life everlasting*, and he will preserve us eternally in that holiness.

This is the article, then, which should continually prevail and continue in operation. For we now have creation complete; and so is redemption also accomplished: but the Holy Ghost exerts his agency without intermission, until the final day; and for that purpose he has ordained a community or church upon earth, through which he speaks, and performs all things; for he has not yet brought together all his followers, nor entirely imparted remission. For this reason, we believe in him, who daily advances us in holiness through the Word, and gives us faith, increasing and strengthening it through this same word and remission of sins; in order that, when all this shall have been accomplished, and we remain steadfast, and die unto the world and all evil, that he may finally make us entirely and eternally holy; for which, through the Word, we now await in faith.

Behold, here you have the whole essence, the will, and operation of the Divinity, portrayed with great elegance, and yet in very few but expressive words. In this consists all our wisdom; it transcends all the wisdom and the intelligence of man. For all the wisdom of the world, although every effort were made to discover what God is, what he has in view, and what he is doing, is still unable to obtain a proper view of either of these. But here you enjoy it all in rich abundance; here in these three articles, he himself has opened and unfolded the depths of his paternal heart—his own pure ineffable love. For he has created us for the very purpose of redeeming and sanctifying us; and besides placing in our possession all that is in heaven and on earth, he has also given us his Son and the Holy Spirit, through whom he brings us unto himself. We could never (as we have shown above) be able to perceive the favor and grace of the Father, unless it should be through Christ the Lord, who is a mirror of his Father's benevolence, and without whom we see nothing but a wrathful and a terrible Judge; nor could we know any thing of Christ, if he were not revealed to us by the Holy Ghost.

These articles of the Creed separate and distinguish Christians from all other persons on earth. For those who are not in the Christian church, no matter whether they be Pagans, Turks, Jews, or hypocrites, even if they believe in, and worship only one true God, still do not know what his will towards them is; neither can they look to him for any love or kindness: wherefore they remain under perpetual wrath and condemnation. For they have not Christ the Lord, and besides, they are not enlightened and favored with any gifts through the Holy Ghost.

Hence you perceive, that the doctrine of the Creed is quite differ-

ent from that of the Ten Commandments. For these teach, indeed, what *we* are to do; but the former states what *God* does for *us*, and what he gives unto us. The Ten Commandments are also inscribed on the hearts of all men; but the Creed no human wisdom is able to comprehend, and it must be taught by the Holy Ghost alone. The doctrine of the former is, therefore, insufficient to make Christians; for the wrath and indignation of God even yet remain upon us, because we are unable to observe that which God requires of us; but the latter confers upon us pure grace, making us pious and acceptable in the sight of God. For through this knowledge we are disposed to love all the commandments of God, because in it we perceive how God gives us himself wholly and entirely, with all that he has and possesses, for aid and assistance in observing the Ten Commandments—the Father with all his creatures, Christ with all his works, the Holy Spirit with all his gifts. Let this suffice, in reference to the Creed for the present, to lay a foundation for the inexperienced, so as not to overburden them; in order that, after having learned to understand the sum and substance of it, they may pursue the study of this subject to a greater extent themselves, and refer to it whatever they may have learned in the Scriptures, ever increasing and growing in a more enlarged understanding. For by teaching and studying these things daily, while we remain here in this life, *scarcely ever shall we* sufficiently learn or teach them.

PART III.

OF PRAYER.

THE LORD'S PRAYER.

We have now heard what we should do and believe; in which things the best and happiest life consists. Now the third part follows, teaching *how we should pray*. For since we see that no one is able to keep the Ten Commandments completely, even if he has begun to believe; and since the devil strives against it, with all his powers, together with the world and our own flesh, there is nothing so necessary as to call incessantly upon the Divine name, invoking and entreating God to grant us faith and the fulfilment of the Ten Commandments, to preserve and increase this faith and fulfilment, and to remove from us all that obstructs and retards our progress. But in order that we might know what and how we

should pray, Christ our Lord himself has taught us the manner and the words, as we shall see.

Before we proceed, however, to illustrate the Lord's Prayer successively, it is very necessary, indeed, to admonish the people and urge them to prayer in the outset, even as Christ and the Apostles did. And our first object should be to know that we *are under obligation to pray* by the command of God. For we have heard in the second commandment—*Thou shalt not take the name of the Lord thy God in vain*—that it is required by that commandment, to praise the holy Name, and in every time of need to call upon it, or to pray. For, to invoke is nothing else but to offer up prayer to God; consequently, this is as strictly and earnestly ordered, as we are forbidden to have other gods, to kill, or to steal, lest any one should think that the consequences are all the same, whether he prays or not, as the rude are accustomed to act under these conceits and imaginations, saying: "Why should I pray? Who knows whether God hears or regards my prayers? If I do not pray, another will pray;"—and thus they fall into the custom of never praying, excusing themselves by the pretext that because we reject false and hypocritical prayer, we teach that people should not or dare not pray.

It is true, however, that the prayers heretofore delivered, vociferated, and sounded in clamorous words in the church, were undoubtedly no prayers. For external things of this kind, if conducted properly, may be an exercise for young children, pupils, and the inexperienced, and may be styled singing or reading, but they cannot be properly called praying. To pray, however, as the second commandment teaches, is—to call upon God in every time of need. This he desires us to do; and it is not left to our own choice, but we should pray and ought to pray, if we wish to be Christians, as well as we should and must obey our father and mother, and the civil government; for through this invocation and entreaty the name of God is employed with due reverence. This above all things you should observe, in order to repress and repel such thoughts as would prevent and deter you from prayer. For even as it would avail nothing, if a son should say to his father, "Of what advantage or consequence is my obedience? I will go on, and perpetrate what I can, it avails equally as much," for here stands the command of God, that you should and must do it; so likewise it is not left discretionary with me to pray, or not to pray, but we should and must pray,* [unless we wish

* Although the portion of this paragraph embraced in brackets, is not contained in the original Dresden edition of 1580; yet inasmuch as it appears in the Leipsic

to incur the wrath and indignation of God. Now, this we should above all things observe and remember, so as to silence and repel the thought, that it makes but little difference if we do not pray, or that those only are commanded to pray who are more holy and acceptable in the sight of God than we are; for these thoughts prevent and deter us from prayer. The heart of man is so perverted by nature, that it ever shrinks from God, and thinks God is averse to our prayers, because we are sinners, and have merited nothing but wrath. Opposed to these thoughts, I say, we should take into consideration this commandment, and turn to God, in order that we may not provoke him to a greater extent, through this disobedience. For by this commandment, he lets us sufficiently understand, that he will neither reject nor repel us from himself even if we are sinners, but that he desires to draw us to himself, so that we may humble ourselves before him, and lay open our distress, entreating him for grace and assistance. To this effect we read in the Scripture, that God is angry with those also who have been oppressed and chastised on account of their sins, because they have not returned unto him, appeased his wrath through prayer, and implored his grace.]

From this you should think and conclude,—since you are so earnestly commanded to pray,—that you should by no means despise your own prayer, but highly and greatly esteem it, always drawing a similitude from the other commandments. For instance, a child should not, by any means, scorn his duty of obedience towards his father and mother, but he should reflect: “Whatever I do, I do from no other motive than obedience, and from submission to the command of God, upon which I can sustain myself, and highly value these duties, not on account of my worthiness, but for the sake of the commandment.” So also here, what we pray and that for which we pray, we should view as required of God, and done in obedience to him; and thus we should think: “On my account it would be nothing, but because God has commanded it, it must avail.” Therefore, every one, for whatever he may have occasion to pray, should always come before God in obedience to this commandment.

We, therefore, entreat, and most earnestly admonish every one to take this matter to heart, and by no means disregard his own prayer; for heretofore, the doctrines which were taught, were so perverse that no one was concerned about these things, thinking the mere utterance of prayer sufficient, whether God heard it or not. This is a

edition of 1790, from which we have made the translation, and since it belongs to the Larger Catechism of Luther, it was deemed proper to retain it here.—[TRANS.]

vague and indefinite offering up of prayer; and consequently, it is ineffectual. For we permit thoughts like these to lead us astray and to perplex us: "I am not holy and worthy enough; if I were as pious and as holy as St. Peter or Paul, I would pray." But away with such thoughts; for even the command which ordered St. Paul to pray, orders me also; and the second commandment was instituted equally as much for my sake as for his; so that he has neither a better nor a more holy commandment to boast of than I have. For this reason, you should say, "My prayer which I make is as precious, indeed, and as holy, and as acceptable in the sight of God, as that of St. Paul, or the most holy saint. I will freely admit that greater holiness belonged to his person, but by no means to the commandment; because God regards prayer, not for the sake of the person, but on account of his word and the obedience manifested towards it; for upon that commandment upon which all saints base their prayers, I also base mine: besides, I pray even for what they all pray, or have prayed. Consequently, it is as highly necessary for me to pray as it was for those eminent saints." The first and most necessary point is, to base all our prayers on obedience towards God, regardless of our persons,—whether we be sinners or pious, worthy or unworthy. And we should know that God will by no means suffer it to pass as a jest, but that he will become angry and inflict punishment if we do not pray, as well as he punishes all other disobedience; and besides, that he will not permit our prayer to be vain and ineffectual. For, if he were not pleased to hear you, he would not command you to pray, and he would not have enjoined it so strictly.

In the second place, we should be the more urged and induced to pray, since God has given us a promise, and declared, that whatever we pray for, shall be sure and certain; as he says, Psalm 50, 15: "Call upon me in the day of trouble; I will deliver thee." And Christ, Matt. 7, 7, 8, says: "Ask, and it shall be given you," &c. "For every one that asketh, receiveth," &c. These promises should excite and stimulate our hearts to pray with love and desire,—since he testifies by his Word, that our prayer is well-pleasing to him, and besides, that it shall be assuredly heard and granted,—lest we should slight or neglect it, or pray in uncertainty.

These promises you can refer to, and say: "Here I come, beloved Father! and I pray, not from my own designs, nor induced by my own worthiness, but incited by thy command and promise, which can neither mislead nor deceive me." Whoever, then, disbelieves these promises, should know that he provokes God to wrath, by dishonoring him in the highest degree, charging him with falsehood.

We should, moreover, be persuaded and constrained to pray, since besides giving the command and promise, God interposes, prescribing the words and manner of prayer himself, and placing in our mouths how and what we should pray; so that we see how earnestly he is concerned about our welfare, and doubt not that such prayer is acceptable before him, and will be assuredly heard; which is an advantage surpassing by far all commandments which we might devise of ourselves. For on this point the conscience would ever remain in doubt, and say: "I have prayed, but who knows how it pleases him, or whether I have attained the legitimate mode and measure of prayer." Therefore, there cannot be found on earth a nobler prayer than the Lord's Prayer, since it has this excellent testimony,—that God so affectionately hears it,—a thing which we should not exchange for the riches of the world.

It is likewise prescribed in certain words, in order that we may perceive and consider the necessity which should urge and constrain us to pray without ceasing. For whoever wishes to pray, must refer to, propose, or mention something which he desires; if he does not, it cannot be called a prayer. We have, therefore, justly rejected the prayer of the monks and priests, who moan and murmur dolefully day and night, but not one of them thinks of praying for the least thing; and if all the churches, with their ecclesiastics, were convoked, they would have to confess that they have never prayed from their hearts, not even for the least thing; for no one of them was induced through obedience to God, or actuated by faith in the promise, to pray, nor perceived any necessity; but they thought no further, (when it was executed in the best manner,) than that they were performing a good work; by which they presumed to compensate God, as those who would not *receive from him*, but only *give to him*.

But wherever prayer is to be genuine, *there* must be earnestness and sincerity, so that we feel our need—such need as urges and impels us to supplicate and to entreat: then prayer proceeds spontaneously from the heart, as it should, without requiring any previous instruction to prepare us and to create devotion for prayer. But we may discern in the Lord's Prayer abundant need of that which should concern us, both with respect to ourselves and our fellow creatures. Therefore, it should also serve to remind us of our wants, and to cause us to perceive them, and deeply to reflect on them, in order that we may not become remiss in prayer. For we all have necessities sufficiently numerous; but the fault consists in this, that we neither feel nor see our state of need. Therefore, God wishes us to present and to declare this need and solicitude, not that he does

not know them, but that thereby our hearts may be encouraged the more earnestly to implore God, and to be prepared the better to receive his bountiful blessings.

Wherefore, we should accustom ourselves daily to pray from our youth up, each one for himself in every time of need, if he but feels something threatening him, and also for other persons among whom he resides—for ministers, magistrates, neighbors, families, &c.—ever, as we have already said, bringing up before God his command and promise, and knowing that he will not have them despised. These things I mention, seriously wishing them to be impressed on the minds of the people, so that they may learn to pray devoutly, and not lead a rude and careless life, in consequence of which they daily become more incapable of praying,—a thing which the devil wishes, and to which he directs all his powers; for he truly feels the injury and harm which result to him, when prayer is fervently and diligently offered.

We should know, that all our protection and defence depend on prayer alone; for we are much too weak to resist Satan with his power and his adherents who assail us, and who could readily trample us under foot. We must, therefore, think of, and lay hold on the weapons with which Christians should be equipped to withstand Satan. For what do you suppose could have hitherto accomplished things so great,—defeating the counsels of our enemy, disclosing their plots, checking their murderous designs, and suppressing their seditions, in which the devil hoped to involve us together with the Gospel,—if the prayers of certain pious persons had not interposed a shield, and had not defended us? Otherwise, our adversaries themselves would have witnessed a far more cruel tragedy, namely, how the devil would have submerged all Germany in her own blood. But now they may deride it presumptuously, and enjoy their insolent triumph; we shall, however, be sufficiently able for them and the devil, through prayer alone, if we only continue diligent and do not become indolent. For wherever a pious Christian prays, “Beloved Father, let thy will be done!” immediately from on high God responds: “Yes, beloved child, it shall be even so, and come to pass, in defiance of the devil and all the world.”

Now, these things are said for admonition, that we may above all things learn to esteem prayer greatly and precious, and to perceive a distinction between verbose babbling and a prayer petitioning for something. For we do not reject prayer, but this loud, senseless moaning and murmuring we reject, as Christ himself also rejected and prohibited vain repetitions, Matt. 6, 7. Now we shall treat

the Lord's Prayer in the briefest and clearest manner possible. Here then, in seven articles or petitions succeeding each other, all the distresses are comprehended which continually befall us; and each one of these is so great, that it should urge us to pray while we exist in this life.

THE FIRST PETITION.

Hallowed be thy name.

This is somewhat obscure, and expressed in terms not altogether familiar to us. For we would more naturally express ourselves thus: Heavenly Father, grant that thy name alone may be hallowed. What is implored by saying, may thy name be hallowed? Is it not already holy? Reply:—Yes, it is ever holy in its essence, but *we* do not hallow it. For the name of God is conferred upon us, because we are baptized and have become Christians, since we are called the children of God, and have the sacraments, through which he incorporates us with himself; so that all that belongs to God, shall contribute to our enjoyment. Here then, the great necessity, which should mostly concern us, is, that the Divine name have its due honor, and be held holy and sacred, as the most exalted and the holiest treasure that we possess; and that we as pious children pray that his name which is holy in heaven, be and remain holy also on earth, among us and throughout the world.

How then does his name become holy among us? Answer (in order to speak as explicitly as we can):—When both our doctrine and our life are godly and Christian. For since we call God our Father in this prayer, we are under obligation to demean and conduct ourselves in every respect as pious children, that he may derive honor and praise from us, and not disgrace. Now, his name is profaned either by words or by actions; for all that we perform on earth, is comprehended in word and deed, in speaking and in doing.

Thus, *in the first place*, it is profaned, when something that is false or seducing, is preached, taught, or spoken under the pretext of the Divine name, so that his name must adorn the falsehood, and give it credibility. Now, this is the greatest indignity and dishonor to the name of God. It is, moreover, violated, when it is grossly employed as a covering for infamy, by swearing, cursing, deceiving, &c.

In the second place, it is profaned by a dissolute life, and deeds manifestly wicked,—when those who are called Christians and the

people of God, are adulterers, inebriates, epicures, and envious detractors; here again the name of God must be exposed to reproach and shame on our account. For even as it is a shame and a dishonor to a natural father, who has a wicked, ill-bred child trespassing against him in words and actions, so that he must, on account of the child, be scorned and abused; so it also reflects dishonor on God, if we who are called after his name, and enjoy all kinds of blessings from him, teach, speak, and live otherwise than pious and heavenly children; so that he must hear it said of us: "You cannot be the children of God, but the children of the devil."

Thus you perceive, that we pray even in this article for the same which God requires in the second commandment, namely, that his name be not abused in swearing, cursing, lying, cheating, &c., but that it be employed usefully to the honor and praise of God. For whoever uses the name of God to any vicious purpose, profanes and desecrates this holy name: even as in former times a church was called desecrated, if murder, or some other malicious act had been perpetrated in it, or if the tabernacle or sanctuary had been disgraced, as this was holy in itself, but had become unholy in its use. Thus this article is clear and distinct, if we but understand the expression correctly, that to sanctify or hallow signifies as much as to praise, extol, and honor both with words and actions.

Here then, observe, how highly necessary such prayer is. For, since we see how the world is filled with sects and false teachers, all using this holy name as a covering and a pretext for their diabolical doctrines, we should justly cry out and exclaim, without intermission, against all these, both, those who teach and believe false doctrines, and those who assail and persecute our Gospel and pure doctrine, endeavoring to suppress it; for instance, all the bishops, tyrants, fanatics, &c. It is, moreover, also necessary for ourselves, who have the Word of God, but are not thankful for it, and do not live according to it as we should. Now, if you pray for this from your heart, you can be certain that it is well-pleasing to God; for nothing does he hear more favorably and affectionately, than that his honor and praise prevail above all things, and that his Word is purely taught, and held dear and high in estimation.

THE SECOND PETITION.

Thy kingdom come.

As we have prayed in the first petition,—which refers to the honor and glory of God's name,—that God would prevent the world from

covering its falsehoods and malicious acts under the pretext of his name, and that we may hold it holy and sacred both in doctrine and in life, that we may praise and extol it ; so we pray here that his kingdom also should come. But even as God's name is holy in itself, and we yet pray that it be hallowed among us ; so, also his kingdom comes of itself, without our prayer ; yet we pray, however, that it may come to us ; that is, that it may prevail among and with us, so that we may also be a portion of those, among whom his name is sanctified, and among whom his kingdom flourishes.

What, then, is the kingdom of God ? Reply :—Nothing else but, as we have heard in the foregoing Creed, that God sent his Son, Christ our Lord, into the world, that he might redeem and liberate us from the power of the devil, and bring us to himself, and rule us, as a king of righteousness, life, and glory, defending us from sin, death, and an unholy conscience. To this effect he has also given us his Holy Spirit, to confer these things upon us through his holy Word, and to illumine and strengthen us in faith, through his power. For this reason, we pray here in the first place, that what Christ has obtained for us, may be efficient among us, and that his name be praised, through the Word of God and a Christian life ; that we, who have embraced that name, may adhere to it and daily increase in it, and also that it may obtain currency and permanency among other people, and prevail powerfully through the world, that many may come to the kingdom of grace, and be participants of redemption, through the Holy Ghost ; in order that we may all thus remain together eternally in one kingdom now commenced.

The kingdom of God comes to us in two different ways :—First, in this world, *temporally*—through the Word and through faith ; afterwards, *eternally*—by manifestation of the life to come. Now, we pray in this petition, both, that this kingdom may come to those who are not yet in it, and to us, who have obtained it, through daily increase, and in future in eternal life. All this is nothing more than saying : “ Beloved Father, we pray thee grant us, first, thy Word, that the Gospel may be purely and sincerely preached through the world ; second, that, being received through faith, it may operate and live in us ; that thy kingdom may thus prevail among us through the Word, and the power of the Holy Spirit ; and that the kingdom of the devil may be overthrown, so that he may have no dominion nor power over us, until, ultimately, his kingdom be entirely subdued, and sin and death and hell destroyed ; so that we may eternally live in the enjoyment of perfect righteousness and felicity.”

Hence you perceive, that here we do not pray for a morsel of

bread, or for temporal and transitory blessings, but for an eternal, inexhaustible treasure, and all that God himself possesses; which is more than any human heart could presume to desire, if God himself had not commanded it to be prayed for. But since he is God, he also wishes to have the honor that he grants much more and more abundantly, than any one is able to comprehend; like a perpetual, inexhaustible fountain, which, the more it discharges and overflows, issues the more freely from its source; and nothing does he more ardently desire from us, than that we supplicate him for many and great blessings; while on the other hand, if we do not confidently pray and entreat, his anger is provoked.

For this would be quite as inconsistent, as if the most opulent and powerful emperor would command a poor indigent beggar to request whatever he might desire, and were ready to grant great and princely gifts, but the foolish mendicant would ask for nothing more than a mess of pottage, he would be justly considered a villain and a wicked wretch, mocking and deriding the command of imperial majesty, in whose presence he would not be worthy to appear.

So it also reflects extreme dishonor and contumely on God,—who offers and promises us so many ineffable blessings,—if we slight his offer and promise, or hesitate to receive them, scarcely venturing to pray for a morsel of bread. But all this may be ascribed to our impious unbelief, which does not look unto God for even as much as will nourish our bodies, much less that we should confidently await these eternal blessings from him. We should, therefore, fortify ourselves against such unbelief, and let this be the first thing for which we pray; and we shall undoubtedly have every thing else abundantly; as Christ, Matt. 6, 33, teaches: “But seek ye first the kingdom of God, and his righteousness, and all these things shall be added unto you.” For how should he allow us to suffer temporal wants, since he promises these eternal and imperishable blessings?

THE THIRD PETITION.

Thy will be done on earth as it is in heaven.

In the foregoing articles or petitions we have prayed that God's name might be honored by us, and that his kingdom might prevail among us. In which two articles, all that pertains to the honor of God and to our salvation is wholly comprehended; so that we obtain God with all his blessings as our own. But here it is, indeed, equally necessary for us firmly to maintain these blessings, and not

to suffer them to be torn away from us. For, as in a well constituted government, there must be, not only those who are occupied in its improvement and in the judicious administration of its laws, but those also who are engaged in defending, guarding, and firmly maintaining it; so also here, when we shall have prayed for the most necessary things, with respect to the Gospel, faith, and the Holy Spirit,—that he would rule over us, and liberate us from the power of Satan,—we must also pray that God would cause his will to be done. For, if we shall remain steadfast in it, many difficulties will arise, so that we must suffer many oppositions and privations on account of it, from all those who strive to impede and to subvert the two foregoing articles.

For no one easily believes how the devil strives against these things, who cannot endure any one to teach correctly or to believe sincerely; and it grieves him beyond measure, when he must suffer his falsehoods and abominable doctrines, trimmed with the fair pretext of the Divine name, to be divulged, and exposed to open shame, and besides, to be driven from the heart, and allow such a breach to be made in the walls of his kingdom. Therefore, he rages and raves like a furious foe, with all his power and might, arraying all his force, and calling to his aid the world and our own flesh, besides. For our flesh in itself is corrupt and prone to evil, even if we have embraced the Word of God, and believe it; and the world is extremely base and wicked: here he incites, instigates, and provokes oppositions, so as to impede and retard us, and finally to overthrow and subject us to his power again. All this is his will and the designs of his malignant breast, which he pursues day and night, and employs all the artifices, all the cunning ways and means which he is able to devise.

Wherefore, if we wish to be Christians, we must consider and be fully persuaded, that we shall have the devil with all his angels and the world as enemies, who shall cause us all kinds of misfortune and affliction. For wherever the Gospel is preached or received or believed, and brings forth fruit, there the holy cross must also be found. And let no one think that he will have peace, but he must hazard whatever he possesses on earth—his fortune and honor, his house and home, his wife and children, his body and life. Now, this severely grieves our flesh, that is, our old Adamic nature; for it is required of us to remain steadfast, and to bear with patience all persecution, and willingly yield what is forced away from us.

Therefore, as necessary as it is to pray incessantly in all other petitions, so necessary is it in this one to pray incessantly, “Thy

will be done, beloved Father, not the will of the devil and our enemies, nor that of all those who persecute thy holy Word, and endeavor to suppress it, or to impede the progress of thy kingdom; and enable us to bear with patience and to overcome all that must be endured, so that our miserable flesh may not through weakness or sloth yield or turn back."

Behold, thus in these three petitions we find displayed in the most simple manner the requirements pertaining to God, yet all for our sake; for that which we implore has reference to ourselves—as already said, that the will of God may be done *in us*, which must be done *out of us*. For even as, without our prayer, his name must be sanctified, and his kingdom must come; so must also his will be done, and prevail, even if the devil with all his adherents strives and furiously rages against it, and undertakes to defeat the Gospel entirely. But for our own sake we must pray that his will may prevail among us also unobstructed, against this their rage, so that their efforts may be ineffectual, and that we may adhere firmly to it against all violence and persecution, and be entirely satisfied with this will of God.

Now, this prayer is to be our protection and defence to avert and overthrow all that the devil, the Pope, the bishops, tyrants, and heretics, are able to do in opposition to the Gospel. Let them all rage at once, and make their utmost endeavors, and devise ways and means for the purpose of oppressing and subverting us, so that their will and counsel may prosper; and in opposition to these, one single Christian or two with this single petition, shall be our fortress against which they may run and wreck themselves. For we have this consolation and confidence, that the will and designs of the devil and of all our enemies must be suppressed, and vanish away, no matter how arrogantly, securely, and strongly they may confide in them. For if their will were not effectually defeated, the kingdom of God could not remain on earth, nor could his name be hallowed.

THE FOURTH PETITION.

Give us this day our daily bread.

Here we take into consideration the necessities of our bodies and temporal life. And these words, although they are brief and simple, are, however, very comprehensive. For if you pray for, and mention daily bread, you pray for all that pertains to the possession and enjoyment of daily bread; and, on the other hand, you deprecate all

that tends to withhold it. You should, therefore, expand your thoughts, so that they may extend, not only to the limits of a kneading-tray or of an oven, but to the most distant fields and over the whole country, which bring forth and produce daily bread and every species of nourishment for us. For if God did not permit all kinds of fruits to grow out of the earth, and bless them, and preserve them from destruction, we would never draw any bread out of the oven, nor have any to put on the table.

But in order to speak briefly, this petition includes all that pertains to this life, since on account of it alone we must have daily bread. Now, it is not sufficient for life, that our bodies have food and raiment, and other necessities alone, but it is necessary for us also to enjoy peace and tranquillity among those persons, with whom we live and converse, and with whom we carry on our daily transactions, negotiations, and contracts of every kind, and in short, whatever belongs both to domestic and political or civil matters and government; for if these two are interrupted, so that they do not proceed as they should, the necessities of life are also intercepted, so that they, finally, cannot be procured. And it is truly a matter of the greatest necessity to pray for civil authority and government, since through these, God mostly preserves our daily bread and the tranquil condition of this life. For, although we may have obtained an abundance of all kinds of good from God, yet we are unable to preserve any of them, or to use them securely and joyfully, if he would not give us a permanent and a peaceful government. For wherever hostilities, contentions, and wars exist, there daily bread is already taken away, or at least diminished.

Wherefore the armorial sign of each pious prince might justly be the picture of a loaf of bread, instead of the image of a lion or of a chaplet of rue, or it might be stamped on the coin for an impression, to remind both them and their subjects, that through their princely office we have protection and peace, and that without them we could neither eat nor retain this indispensable bread; for which reason, they are also worthy of all honor, so that we should yield unto them the duties we owe and are able to discharge, as to those through whom we enjoy with peace and tranquillity all that we have, when otherwise we could not preserve a farthing. And besides, we should pray for them, so that God may give unto us, through them, the greater blessings and abundance.

Thus we have exhibited and delineated, in the briefest manner, how far this petition extends through the various kinds of intercourse on earth. And out of it we might make a long prayer, and enumerate all

those parts which belong to it; as for instance, to pray God to give us meat and drink, raiment, house and home, and health of body; moreover, to permit grain and fruits to grow and prosper in the fields; and finally, to aid us in transacting our domestic duties properly, and to bless us with pious companions, children, and domestics, and to protect them; to permit our labors, our professions, or in whatever we may be occupied, to increase and prosper, and to provide us with faithful neighbors and good friends. Again, to entreat God to grant to emperors, kings, and all estates, and especially to the prince of our country, to all consuls, peers, and prefects, wisdom, fortitude, and success in ruling well, and in triumphing victoriously over the Turk and all our enemies; to grant to the subjects and the common multitude to live in obedience, peace, and concord among each other; and again, to protect us against all temporal injuries, such as destructive fires, tempests, inundations, pestilence, distempers, venom, wars, bloodshed, famine, wild beasts, and wicked people. All of which it is necessary to impress on the minds of the inexperienced, showing them that all blessings must be received of God, and prayed for by us.

But especially is this petition directed against our chief enemy, the devil. For it is his whole wish and desire to take away or withhold all that we receive from God. Nor is he content with perplexing and disturbing spiritual government, by deceiving the souls of men through his falsehoods, and bringing them under his power; but he also exerts every power within himself to prevent the existence of any government, or of honorable and peaceful administration of affairs upon earth—here he excites so many litigations, slaughters, seditions, and wars; moreover, he sends tempests and hail to destroy the fruits; he infests the flocks with contagions; he pollutes the atmosphere with poison. And in a word, it is painful to him to see any one receive a morsel of bread from God, and to eat it in peace; and if it lay within his power, and if he were not checked by our prayers, (through God,) we should most assuredly not retain a straw on the field, or a farthing in the house, yes, not even our life a single hour; especially those of us who observe the Word of God, and wish to be Christians.

Thus God wishes to exhibit to us how solicitous he is about all our wants, and how faithfully he provides for our temporal support. And although he grants and preserves these blessings bountifully, even for the ungodly and the knave; yet he desires us to pray for those things, in order that we may acknowledge that we receive them from his munificent hand, and that we perceive in them his paternal goodness towards us. For if he should withdraw his hand, nothing

could prosper, nor finally be preserved, as indeed we see and feel daily. What kind of misery now exists in the world in consequence of spurious coin, yes, of daily oppressions and exactions in ordinary commerce, contracts, business, and labors, of those, who according to their own wanton desires, oppress the unfortunate, and withhold from them their daily bread?—things indeed which we must suffer; but they must take heed, that they do not lose this common prayer; and they should guard themselves, lest this portion of the Lord's Prayer should operate against them.

THE FIFTH PETITION.

And forgive us our trespasses, as we forgive those who trespass against us.

This article touches our miserable and wretched life; and, although we may have the Word of God, though we may believe, do his will or suffer it to be done, and nourish ourselves with the gifts and blessings of God, yet this life does not proceed without sin; for we still daily digress much, and exceed proper bounds, while we live in this world among people, who cause us a great deal of sorrow, and give us occasion for impatience, wrath, and revenge. And besides this, we are pursued by the devil, who urges us on every side, and strives (as we have already heard) against all the foregoing articles, so that it is impossible always to remain firm in this perpetual contest.

Here, then, it is again highly necessary to pray and to exclaim: "Beloved Father, forgive us our trespasses." Not, that he does not also forgive sins without and prior to our prayer. For he gave us the Gospel, in which there is free remission of sin, before we prayed for it, or ever thought any thing in reference to it. But for this reason we should pray, that we may acknowledge and accept such forgiveness. For, since the flesh, in which we daily live, is of such a nature as not to trust and believe in God, and is ever agitated with evil lusts and wicked desires, so that we daily sin in words and actions, by commission and omission, in consequence of which our consciences become dissatisfied and fear the wrath and indignation of God, and thus we let our consolation and confidence afforded by the Gospel, sink down; it is, therefore, necessary to resort to this source without intermission, and to receive consolation, and raise up our consciences again.

And indeed, the consequence of this should be, that God may subdue our pride, and keep us in humility. For he has reserved the prerogative to himself alone, that, if any one wish to boast of his

piety, and despise others, he should examine himself, and place this prayer before his eyes, and thus he may soon discern that he is better in no respect than others; for we must all drop our plume before God, and rejoice that we may become participants of remission. And let no one think, while we live here, to arrive at such a degree of perfection, that he has no need of this forgiveness: and in a word, if God does not forgive us continually, we are lost.

Consequently, then, the meaning of this petition is, that we desire God not to look upon our sins, or to charge us with that which we daily deserve, but to act towards us graciously, and to forgive us, as he has promised, and thus afford us a joyful and tranquil conscience, so that we can approach him in prayer. For if the heart is not at peace with God, and cannot obtain this assurance, it will never venture to pray. This assurance, however, and joyfulness of heart we cannot obtain, unless we know with certainty that our sins are forgiven.

Here there is, however, a necessary and yet a consolatory clause annexed: *As we forgive those who trespass against us.* He has promised, that we shall be certain that all our sins are forgiven and pardoned, provided we also forgive our neighbors. For, as we daily commit many offences against God, and still he forgives all through grace; so we must also ever forgive our neighbors who do us injury, violence, and injustice, and manifest a wicked disposition towards us. But if you do not forgive, think not that God will forgive you; if, on the other hand, you forgive, you have the consolation and assurance, that you are forgiven in heaven, not on account of your forgiveness towards others, for God does it freely and through pure grace, because he has promised it, as the Gospel teaches; but for the purpose of strengthening and assuring us, he proposes this as an evidence in connection with the promise; which accords with this petition, Luke 6, 37: "Forgive, and ye shall be forgiven." For this reason, Christ also repeats it immediately after the Lord's Prayer, Matt. 6, 14, saying: "For if ye forgive men their trespasses, your heavenly Father will also forgive you."

Therefore, this evidence is connected with this petition, that when we pray, we may be reminded of the promise, and thus think: "Beloved Father, for this reason I come and pray, that thou wouldst forgive me, not that I can make satisfaction, or that I merit enough by my works, but because thou hast promised it, and set thy seal to it, so that it might be as certain as if I had absolution announced by thyself." For, as much as Baptism and the Sacrament, instituted as external evidences, avail, so much can this evidence also avail us

strengthening and cheering our consciences ; and it is even particularly set before us, that we might use and exercise it every hour, as a thing which we continually have with us,

THE SIXTH PETITION.

And lead us not into temptation.

We have now sufficiently heard what pains and labor are required to retain all that we pray for, and to persevere in it constantly ; and even then we cannot accomplish this end without error and stumbling. And besides, although we may have obtained remission of sins and a clear conscience, and be entirely absolved, yet the condition of this life is of such a nature, that one may stand to-day, and fall to-morrow. We must, therefore, even if we are pious, and stand with clear conscience before God, still pray, that he may not permit us to fall back again, and yield to difficulties or temptations. Temptation, however, or, as our Saxons formerly called it, *Beköhrung*, allurements, is of three kinds,—that of the *flesh*, that of the *world*, and that of the *devil*. For we dwell in the *flesh*, and our Adamic nature cleaves to us, which exerts its influence, and daily entices us to unchastity, indolence, excess, avarice, deception, and fraud, and in short, to all evil lusts which cleave to us by nature, and which are excited by others, namely, by associates, by examples, by hearing and seeing, which frequently inflame and corrupt even an innocent heart.

And finally, the *world* adds its force, which offends us with words and actions, and provokes us to wrath and impatience. And in a word, there is nothing seen here but wrath and envy, animosity, violence and injustice, treachery, revenge, imprecation, reproach, detraction, arrogance, pride, ostentation, worldly honor, fame, and power ; here no one is willing to be the least, but desires to be the greatest, and to attract notice in preference to all others.

And in addition to these, the *devil* comes, instigating and provoking every where. But especially is he occupied in those disturbances which pertain to the consciences and to spiritual matters ; that is, he endeavors to cause us to disregard and slight both the Word and works of God, so that he may draw us away from faith, hope, and love, and bring us to unbelief, presumption, pride, and *obduracy*, or even to extreme despair, the denial and blasphemy of God, and to other innumerable, detestable crimes. These are snares

and nets, yes, real fiery darts most malignantly hurled into the human heart, not by flesh and blood, but by the devil himself.

These are indeed great and grievous dangers and oppositions, which every Christian must endure, and grievous enough are they, if but one alone had to be borne. Therefore, we should be urged by these to invoke and pray God incessantly, while we are in this depraved life, in which we are assailed, pursued, and persecuted on every side, not to let us become faint and weary, and fall back again into sin, shame, and unbelief; for otherwise, it is impossible to overcome even the slightest attack.

Now, this may be termed not leading us into temptation, if God gives us power and strength to withstand it; although the temptation be not removed or taken away. For temptation and enticement none of us can avoid, while we live in the flesh and the devil surrounds us; and there is no other alternative, we must endure temptations, yes, we must be involved in them; but here we pray, that we may not fall into them, and be overwhelmed.

To feel temptation, therefore, and to consent or agree to it, are things very different. We must all feel temptations, not however all alike; but some more numerous and severe ones than others; for instance, youth are especially infested by the temptations of the flesh; again, the adult and the aged are tempted by the world; but others who are engaged in spiritual matters, that is, stronger Christians, are tempted by the devil. But this feeling, since it is repugnant to our will, and since we would rather be freed from it, can injure no one; for if it were not felt, it could not be called a temptation. But we give our consent to them, when we indulge in them through our loose habits, without resisting or praying against them.

Therefore, we Christians must be prepared for, and daily expect the incessant attacks of temptation, so that none of us may act as securely and carelessly as if the devil were far from us; but we should every where await the stroke, and avert it. For although I may now be chaste, patient, and cheerful, and in firm faith, still the devil can in this hour hurl such a dart into my heart, that I can scarcely withstand it; for he is a foe who never ceases nor becomes weary, so that if one temptation discontinues, other and new ones continually succeed.

Under these difficulties, then, no other resource nor remedy remains, but to appeal to the Lord's Prayer, and thus converse with God from the heart: "Thou hast ordered me, beloved Father, to pray, let me not fall back through temptation." Thus you will perceive that the temptation will be diminished, and finally be over-

come. Otherwise, if you undertake to help yourself by your own thoughts and counsels, you will render it worse, and give the devil more room; for he has a serpent's head, which, gaining a chasm through which it can pass, draws his whole body along unimpeded; but this prayer can check it and repel him.

THE SEVENTH AND LAST PETITION.

But deliver us from evil. Amen.

This article reads thus in the Greek: *αλλα ρυσαι ημας απο του πονηρου*, deliver or preserve us from evil or the wicked one; and it appears even as if he spoke concerning the devil, and as if he wished to comprehend all in one mass, so that the whole sum of all our prayers may be directed against our chief enemy. For he it is who impedes among us all that we pray for—the name or honor of God, the kingdom and will of God, daily bread, peaceful and joyful conscience, &c.

We shall, therefore, in conclusion, bring these things all together, and say: “Grant, beloved Father, that we may be liberated from all misfortunes.” Yet in the evil which may befall us, under the kingdom of the devil, are included—poverty, shame, death, and in a word, all the distressing calamities and afflictions which are so innumerable on earth. For the devil, since he is not only a liar, but also a murderer, seeks continually after our lives, and wreaks his anger to bring us into misfortunes and injuries. Hence it is, that he causes many a one to break his neck, deprives many of the use of their minds, others he causes to drown themselves, and many he forces to commit suicide, and to do many other terrible crimes. Therefore, while we remain on earth, it requires all that we can do to pray continually against this chief enemy. For if God would not preserve us, we would not be secure a single hour in consequence of this foe.

Hence you perceive again how God desires us to entreat him for all things, even in reference to those which injure our bodies, so that we may neither seek nor await assistance from any other source but from him. This however he has laid down in the last place; for if we shall be preserved and delivered from all evil, the name of God must first be hallowed in us, his kingdom be among us, and his will be done, then he will finally guard us against sin and shame; moreover, from all that is grievous or pernicious to us.

Thus God has briefly enumerated all the necessities by which we may be pressed, so that we indeed can have no excuse for neglecting

prayer. But upon this the efficacy of prayer depends, that we also learn to say, in addition, *Amen*; that is, not to doubt that it is assuredly heard, and will be granted. For it is nothing else but a word of indubitable faith, praying not with uncertainty, but knowing that God does not deny it, since he has promised to grant it. Wherever such faith does not exist, there it is also impossible for a true prayer to be. It is therefore a pernicious conceit in those, who so pray that they dare not add the word *Amen* to the end of their prayer and conclude with certainty that God hears it, but remain in doubt, and say: "How should I feel so daring, and presume that God hears my prayer? Am I not still a miserable sinner?" &c.

They act in this way, because they do not regard the promises of God, but look upon their own works and worthiness, contemning God, and charging him with falsehood; for this reason they also receive nothing, as St. James, 1, 6, 7, says: "But let him ask in faith, nothing wavering: for he that wavereth is like a wave of the sea, driven by the wind, and tossed. For let not that man think that he shall receive any thing of the Lord." Behold! how much God is concerned about these things in order that we should be certain that we do not pray in vain; we should therefore by no means lightly esteem our prayer.

PART IV.

OF BAPTISM.

We have now completed the three chief articles of the common Christian doctrine. Besides these, it remains yet for us to speak of our two Sacraments, instituted by Christ, concerning which every Christian should have at least some general information, since there can be no Christian without them; although, alas! hitherto nothing has been taught concerning them. We shall, in the first place, however, take up the subject of Baptism, through which we are first taken into the community of Christians. But in order that it may be clearly understood, we shall treat it in regular order, and adhere to that alone which is necessary for us to know. For the manner

in which it is to be maintained and defended against heretics and factions, we shall commit to the learned.

In the first place, it is above all things necessary to be well acquainted with the words upon which Baptism is founded, and to which may be referred all that is to be said about it, namely, where Christ, the Lord, Matt. 28, 19, says:

Go ye, therefore, and teach all nations, baptizing them in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

Again, in the last chapter of Mark:

He that believeth and is baptized, shall be saved; but he that believeth not, shall be damned. Mark 16, 16.

You should in the first place observe, that in these words the command and institution of God are embraced, so that no one may doubt Baptism to be a divine ordinance, not devised or invented by men. For as I can declare with certainty, that no man has produced the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer out of his own imagination, but God himself has revealed and given them; so I can likewise assert without hesitation, that Baptism is not a human device, but an institution of God himself; and besides, it is earnestly and strictly commanded, that we must permit ourselves to be baptized, or we shall not be saved; lest any one should think it a thing so light as the putting on of a new scarlet garment. For it is of the utmost importance to maintain Baptism in its exalted and invaluable character, for which we mostly strive and contend, since the world is now so full of sects, who exclaim, Baptism is an external thing, and an external thing is useless. But let an external thing be as it may, here stand the word and command of God, however, by which Baptism is instituted and confirmed; and whatever God institutes and commands to be done, can certainly not be a useless thing, but it must be exceedingly precious, even if it were in appearance less than a mite of straw. If the Pope's distributing indulgences with his letters and bulls, or confirming altars or churches by them, could hitherto be esteemed highly, for the sake of the letter only and the seal; on this account we should esteem Baptism much higher and more precious, because God has commanded it, and because it is administered in his name; for thus read the words: *Go, and baptize*,—not in your name, but in the name of God.

To be baptized in the name of God, is not to be baptized by man, but by God himself. For this reason, even if it is administered through the hand of man, it is nevertheless truly God's own work; hence each one can easily conclude for himself, that it is much more sublime than any work done by a saint or by any other man. For

what work can be performed that is greater than the work of God? But here the devil is most carefully occupied in deceiving us with false appearances, and of leading us from the work of God to our own performance. For it seems to be much more splendid and precious if a Carthusian friar performs many great and laborious works, and all of us esteem our own works and merits much more than those of God. But the Scripture teaches, that even if all the works of the monks were collected in a mass, no matter how precious they might appear, they would still not be as noble and good as if God should lift up a mite of straw. Why? Because the person is nobler and better. Now, here we must not estimate the person according to the works, but the works according to the person, from whom they must receive their dignity and value. But human reason will not thus regard Baptism; and because it does not shine like the works which we perform, we imagine it must avail nothing.

Learn, then, from these remarks to form a proper view of this matter, and, to the question, What is Baptism? to reply thus:—It is not merely simple water, but it is water embraced in the word and command of God, and through this it is sanctified, so that it is nothing else but divine water; not that the water in itself is better than other water, but because it is connected with the word and command of God. For this reason, it is nothing but the illusion of the devil, that our innovators at the present day, for the purpose of degrading Baptism, separate from it the word and institution of God, and view but the water which is dipped out of the fountain, and then exclaim with foaming lips:—"How can a handful of water help the soul?" Yes, beloved friend, who does not know that if it is taken by itself, water is water? But how dare you thus commit violence on the order of God, and tear from it the most valuable treasure, with which God has connected it, and which he will by no means have separated from it? For the word or command of God, and the name of God, constitute its essential quality,—a treasure which is greater and nobler than heaven and earth.

In this manner, then, learn to discern that the water of Baptism is quite a different thing from all other water, not on account of the natural substance, but because here something more noble is connected with it. For God himself honors it with his name, and confirms it with his power and authority. For this reason, it is not only natural water, but divine, heavenly, holy, and blessed water, for it cannot be extolled too highly, all for the sake of the word, which is a heavenly, holy word, which no one can praise sufficiently; for it possesses all that is God's: hence it receives its essence also, en-

titling it to the appellation of Sacrament, as St. Augustine also has taught: *Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*; that is, when the word comes to the element or the natural object, it becomes a sacrament, that is, a holy ordinance—a divine testimony.

Therefore, we ever teach that the sacraments and all external things, which God orders and institutes, should be viewed, not according to the gross external forms, as we look upon the hull of a nut, but according to the manner in which the word of God is included in them. For thus we speak in reference also to parents, and civil magistrates. If we view these, merely as having eyes, noses, skin, hair, flesh, and bones, we see that they resemble Turks and heathens; and some one might come, and say: “Why shall I hold these higher in estimation than others?” But since the commandment says: *Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother*, we thus see another person, vested and adorned with the majesty and glory of God. This commandment, I say, is the golden chain which he wears around his neck; yes, the crown upon his head, which shows me how and why I shall honor this flesh and blood.

In like manner and still more should you honor and esteem Baptism, for the sake of the word,—an institution which God himself has honored both with words and deeds, and which he has confirmed, besides, with visible miracles from heaven. For, do you suppose that it was a jest, when Christ permitted himself to be baptized, that the heavens opened, the Holy Ghost descended visibly, and every thing glowed with divine glory and majesty? I therefore again admonish, that the word and the water be not separated. For if the word is separated from the water, it is not different from that used for ordinary purposes, and it may well be styled a common ablution; but when it is connected with the word, as God has ordained it, it is a sacrament, and it is called Christian Baptism. So much concerning the nature and value of this holy sacrament.

In the second place, inasmuch as we now know what Baptism is, and how it is to be regarded, we must also learn the *purpose* and *end* for which it was instituted, that is, its benefits and effects. This we have admirably set forth in the words of Christ, quoted above, namely: “He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved,” Mark 16, 16. Therefore, comprise it in the most simple manner, thus, The virtue, work, use, fruit, end of Baptism, is to save. For no one is baptized in order to become a prince, but, as the words say, in order to be saved. It is well known, however, that *to be saved* implies nothing less than to be liberated from sin, death, and the devil, to come into the kingdom of Christ, and to live eternally with him.

Here you perceive again how precious and valuable Baptism is to be esteemed, since we obtain in it such an inestimable treasure,—a circumstance which goes far to prove that Baptism cannot be mere, simple water; for simple water could not effect what is thus accomplished by the word of God, and because, as previously said, the name of God is in it. But wherever the name of God is, there also must be life and salvation; hence it is truly a divine, blissful, fruitful, and gracious water; for through the word it obtains the power to become a washing of regeneration, as St. Paul terms it, Tit. 3, 5.

But in reply to our sophists, the innovating spirits, who assert that faith alone saves, and that works and external things add nothing to salvation, we say, it is true, that nothing in *us* effects it, but faith, as we shall hear subsequently. But these blind leaders will not observe, that faith must have something which it believes, that is, to which it adheres, and upon which it rests and depends. Thus faith adheres to the water, and believes that in Baptism are embraced life and eternal happiness, not through any virtue of the water, as has been sufficiently stated, but through Baptism's being connected with the word and ordinance of God, and ennobled by his name. Now, if I believe this, in what else do I believe but in God, as in him who has given and implanted his name in Baptism, and proposed to us this external object, in which we are able to lay hold of this treasure?

Now, these innovators are so insane as to separate faith and the object to which it adheres, although that object is external. Indeed it should and must be external, so that it can be perceived and apprehended by the senses, and conveyed to the heart through them; for the whole Gospel is an external and oral message. In a word, whatever God does and performs in us, he wishes to effect through such external ordinances. Now, wherever he speaks, yes, rather in whatever way or through whatever instrument he speaks, to this the eyes of faith are to be directed, and to this faith must cleave. Now, here we have the words: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." In reference to what else are these words spoken, but to Baptism; that is, the water embraced in the ordinance of God? It follows, therefore, that whoever rejects Baptism, rejects the Word of God, rejects faith, and Christ, who refers and binds us to Baptism.

In the third place, since we perceive the great benefit and efficacy of Baptism, let us proceed to inquire who is the person that receives the gifts and benefits of Baptism; and this is also most beautifully and clearly expressed even in these words: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved." That is, faith alone makes the person

worthy to receive this heavenly, sacred water beneficially. For since this blessing is proffered and promised here in the words, by and with the water, it cannot be received otherwise than by our believing it from our hearts. Without faith Baptism is of no benefit, although in itself it is a divine, inestimable treasure. Upon these few words,—*He that believeth*,—so much therefore depends, that they exclude and reject all works which we can do with a view to merit and obtain salvation through them. For it is irrevocably decreed, that whatever is not faith, profits nothing in obtaining salvation, nor can it receive any blessing.

But if they exclaim, as they are accustomed to do: “Baptism itself is a work, and you say works are of no consequence in obtaining salvation, wherein then does faith consist?” Reply:—Yes, it is true, our works do nothing towards salvation; but Baptism is not our work, it is the *work of God*; (for you must, as already said, draw a wide line of distinction between the Christian baptism and common ablution;) but the works of God are salutary and essential to salvation, not excluding, but requiring faith; for without faith we could not comprehend them. For, by permitting the water to be poured over you, you have not yet received Baptism in such a manner as to benefit you; but it becomes of saving effect to you, if you permit yourself to be baptized under the persuasion that it is according to the order and command of God, and besides, receive it in his name, so that you may receive in the water the promised salvation. Now, neither the hand nor the body can do this, but the heart must believe. Thus you perceive clearly, that here there is no work performed by us, but a treasure received which God gives us, and which faith apprehends; even as Christ the Lord on the Cross is not a work, but a treasure included in the word, and presented to us through it, and received through faith. Therefore, they do us injustice, who cry out against us that we preach in opposition to faith, when at the same time we insist upon it alone, as being so essentially necessary, that without it we can neither receive nor enjoy any thing whatever.

Thus we have the three parts, which are necessary to be known concerning this sacrament, especially that God’s ordinance is to be held in all due honor, which alone would be sufficient to move us to its observance, even if it were wholly an external thing; just as the commandment, *Thou shalt honor thy father and thy mother*—referring only to external flesh and blood, and which we observe not in consideration of this flesh and blood, but with reference to the commandment in which they are included, and for the sake of which this

flesh is called father and mother. Thus in like manner, even if we had nothing more than these words: *Go and baptize*, &c., we should even then accept it, and do as the order of God directs. Now, here we have not only the command and precept of God, but also the promise; for which reason Baptism is far more excellent than that which God has commanded and ordered at other places. In a word, it is so full of consolation and grace, that heaven and earth are unable to reach its sublimity. But this requires an active faith, in order to believe it to be true,—not that the treasure is inadequate, but that we are deficient in embracing and retaining it.

Every Christian, therefore, has enough to learn and to practice in Baptism during his life; for he must ever exert himself to maintain a firm faith in what it promises and brings him, namely, triumph over the devil and death, the remission of sins, the grace of God, Christ with all his works, and the Holy Ghost with all his gifts. In short, the blessings of Baptism are so great, that if feeble nature could but comprehend them we might justly doubt their reality. For, imagine to yourself a physician, who possessed an art preventing persons from dying; or, even if they died, immediately restoring them to life so as to live eternally afterwards, how the world would rush and flock around him with money, while the poor, prevented by the rich, could not approach him! And yet here in Baptism, every one has such a treasure and medicine gratuitously brought to his door—a medicine which abolishes death, and preserves all men to eternal life.

Thus we should view Baptism, and appropriate it to ourselves, so that by it we may strengthen and console ourselves when our sins or our consciences oppress us, and say: “I am, nevertheless, baptized, and if I am baptized, it is promised me that I shall be saved, and that I shall have eternal life, both in soul and body.” For it is on this account that Baptism embraces these two things—the application of water, and the pronunciation of words which are apprehended by the soul. Now, since both water and word constitute one baptism, it follows that both body and soul must also be saved, and live eternally: the soul through the word, in which it believes; the body, however, because it is united with the soul, and also apprehends Baptism as it is able to apprehend it. For this reason, we have nothing more precious in our bodies and souls; for through Baptism we become holy and happy,—a condition which otherwise no course of life, no works on earth, can attain.

Let this suffice, then, with respect to the nature, benefit, and use

of Baptism, it being considered at sufficient length for the present occasion.

OF INFANT BAPTISM.

Here a question arises, by which the devil through his followers confuses the world, with respect to Infant Baptism; and it is this: "Do they also believe, and is it right to baptize them?" In reply we briefly say:—Let every man who is inexperienced, decline this question, and leave it to the learned; but if you wish to answer, answer thus:

That Infant Baptism is pleasing to Christ, is sufficiently proved by his own acts; namely, God has sanctified many of those, and given the Holy Spirit to many baptized in their infancy, and at the present day there are many still, in whom it is perceived both from their doctrines and their deportment of life, that they have the Holy Spirit; as it is also given to us through the grace of God to be able to expound the Scriptures, and to acknowledge Christ, which could not be done without the Holy Spirit. But if God did not approve of Infant Baptism, he would not grant even a particle of grace from the Holy Spirit. In a word, if Infant Baptism were wrong, hitherto, down to the present day, there could not have been a Christian on earth. Now, since God confirms Baptism by the communication of his Holy Spirit, as it is truly perceived in some of the Fathers, as, St. Bernard, Gerson, John Huss, and others, who were baptized in their infancy; and as the holy Christian church can not discontinue until the end of the world, it must indeed be acknowledged that such baptism of children is pleasing to God. For he cannot be against himself, or favor falsehood and knavery, or grant his grace and Spirit to this end. This is perhaps the best and strongest evidence for the inexperienced and unlearned. For this article, *I believe in a holy Christian church, the communion of saints, &c.*,—can neither be withdrawn from us, nor can it be overthrown.

Here we further assert, that it is not of the greatest importance as to this point, whether the person baptized believes or does not believe; for Baptism does not become wrong on this account, but all depends upon the word and command of God. Now this is indeed a nice point, but it is founded upon the assertion, that Baptism is nothing else than water and the word of God intimately united; that is, when the word is connected with the water, then baptism is right, although the individual be destitute of faith at the time of his baptism; for my faith does not *make*, but it *receives* Baptism. Now Baptism does

not become wrong, even if it be wrongly received and applied, since, as observed above, it does not depend on our belief, but upon the word of God.

For even if a Jew, at this day, should come with deceit and wicked design, and with all sincerity we should baptize him, we should nevertheless say that the baptism would be right. For here is the water together with the word of God, even if he does not receive it as he should: precisely as the unworthy who go to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, receive the true Sacrament, even if they do not believe.

Thus you perceive, that the objection of the factious spirits is vain and useless. For, as said, even if children believe not, which however is not the fact, (as now shown,) the baptism would still be right, and no one should rebaptize them; even as the Lord's Supper is not impaired, when some one approaches it with an evil design; and it would not be admissible for him in consequence of this, to receive it again in the very same hour, as if he had not before received the true Sacrament; for this would be blaspheming and calumniating the Sacrament in the highest degree. In what way do the word and institution of God become nugatory and of no avail, because we use them improperly?

For this reason we say, if you have not believed, believe yet, and thus declare: "The baptism was surely right, but I alas! have not received it rightly." For I myself, and all who permit themselves to be baptized, must thus say before God: "I come hither in my faith and that of others, yet I cannot depend on my belief and the prayers of many others for me, but I rely on thy word and command, even as I go to the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, not upon my faith, but upon the words of Christ, whether I be strong or weak, for this I let God provide; but I know that he orders me to go, to eat, and to drink, &c., and that he gives me his body and his blood,—which words will neither belie nor deceive me."

Now, we pursue the same course with respect to Infant Baptism. We bring forward the child under the impression and the hope that it believes, and we pray God to give it faith; but we do not baptize it on this account, but rather because God has commanded us to do so. Why so? Because we know that God does not lie. I and my neighbor, and in a word, all persons, may prove false and deceitful, but the Word of God cannot fail.

Wherefore, those are presumptuous and deluded spirits, who infer, that where faith is not right, there baptism must also be wrong;

precisely as if I would conclude, that should I not believe, it must follow that Christ is nothing ; or thus, if I be not obedient, there must be neither father, nor mother, nor magistrate. Is this a correct and fortunate conclusion, if no one does what he ought, that the thing in itself shall be nothing, or avail nothing ? Rather reverse the argument, and conclude thus : that for the very reason that Baptism has been received improperly, it is right and of importance. For if it were not right in itself, it could not be misused, and there would be no sin committed by abuse. It is thus : *Abusus non tollit sed confirmat substantiam*, abuse does not destroy the substance, but confirms it ; for gold remains no less gold, even though a harlot should wear it in sin and shame.

Let it, therefore, be concluded that Baptism is always right, and maintains its full nature or character, though but a single individual were baptized, and though he did not truly believe. For the order and Word of God are not to be changed or rendered mutable by men. But these fanatical spirits are so blinded as not to see the word and command of God ; and they do not look upon Baptism otherwise than water in a brook or in a vessel ; or upon a magistrate otherwise than upon any other person ; and because they see neither faith nor obedience, they consider Baptism and the magistracy to be of no avail in themselves. Here is an insidious, seditious spirit, which would readily tear off the crown from civil authority, to have it trampled under foot, and besides, would pervert all the works and ordinances of God, and reduce them to nothing. We must, therefore, be on our guard and well prepared, and not suffer ourselves to be directed or drawn away from the Word of God, lest we should consider Baptism a mere empty sign, as the fanatics dream.

In the last place, it is also necessary to know what Baptism signifies, and why God instituted this external sign and form in the celebration of this sacrament, through which we are first taken into the community of the Christian church. The act consists in our being put in connection with the water, and, after its passing over us, in being withdrawn from it again. These two, our being put in connection with the water, and being withdrawn from it again, signify the efficacy and the work of Baptism, which are nothing else but the mortification of the old Adam, and afterwards, the rearing up of the new man ; both of which are to be pursued by us through our whole life, so that a Christian life is nothing else but a daily baptism, once begun and ever to be continued. For it is necessary for us to lead such lives, that we may ever cleanse ourselves of whatever belongs to the old man, and come forth in what-

ever pertains to the new. What then is our old Adamic nature? It is that which is innate in us from Adam,—urging us to hatred, envy, unchastity, avarice, indolence, arrogance,—yes, to unbelief, with all blasphemies, and to whatever else that is immoral in its tendency. Now when we enter into the kingdom of Christ, these vices must daily decrease, so that we may become continually milder, more patient, and meeker, and become still freer from unbelief, avarice, hatred, envy, and arrogance.

This is the proper use of Baptism among Christians, indicated through the act of baptizing with water. Now, if this amendment of life does not follow, but the old Adamic nature is left unrestrained to increase in vigor, the design of Baptism is frustrated, and God's ordinance is opposed. For those who are out of Christ can do nothing else but daily become worse, as the proverb truly says, "Worse and worse; the longer he sins, the more wicked the sinner." If, last year, one was arrogant and avaricious, he is now much more avaricious and haughty; so that vice progresses with age, and increases from early infancy. A young child has no peculiar vice, but if it grows up, it becomes immodest and unchaste, and when it attains the years of maturity, real vice prevails, and continually increases.

Our old nature, therefore, acts unrestrained, if it is not checked and suppressed through the power of Baptism. On the other hand, where persons have become Christians, it daily decreases, until it ceases entirely. This is properly speaking, the daily burial in, and resurrection from Baptism. Thus this external sign was instituted not only to operate efficaciously, but also to signify something. Now, wherever faith is manifested by its fruits, there Baptism is not an empty signification, but the work of mortifying the flesh is connected with it; but where faith does not exist, there a mere fruitless sign remains.

And here you perceive that Baptism, both in its virtue and in its signification, includes the *third sacrament* also, as it was customary to call repentance, which is properly nothing else but Baptism, or its application. For what else is repentance but attacking the old man with earnestness, and entering into a new life? If, therefore, you live in repentance, you show the fruits of Baptism, which not only signifies this new life, but also demonstrates and practises it. For in this Baptism, the Holy Spirit, grace, and virtue, are given to suppress the old man, that the new may come forth and increase in strength.

Therefore, Baptism ever continues valid. And even if one falls from it and sins, we nevertheless always have access to it, that we may again subject the old man to ourselves. But no one is permitted to sprinkle us with water again; for, if a person should even

permit himself to be immersed into water a hundred times, it would still be no more than one baptism; this work, however, continues and the signification is permanent. Thus repentance is nothing else than an access and a reaccess to Baptism,—to repeat and to practice that which we had before commenced, and which, however, we had neglected.

This I say, in order that we may not fall into the error, which we had entertained a long time, that we could no more avail ourselves of the benefit of Baptism, after we had fallen into sin again. And this error arises in consequence of not considering Baptism any thing more than an external work which was once performed. And indeed it originated from these words, written by St. Jerome: "Repentance is a subsidiary plank, which is intended to rescue us, and upon which we must swim and pass over the sea of this world, after the vessel is broken, into which we had stept and taken sail, when we entered into the community of the Christian church." But by these words, the use of Baptism is destroyed, so that it can be of no more benefit to us. They are, therefore, neither correctly spoken, nor rightly conceived; for Baptism does not fail, since, as already said, it is the order or institution of God, and not a device of ours: but it is not a rare occurrence to depart from it; yet if any one departs, let him see that he swim to it, and hold on, till he gets on board again, and pursues his course in it, as he had commenced.

Thus we see how excellent an institution Baptism is; it rescues us from the jaws of the devil, makes God our own, subdues and removes our sins, and strengthens the new man in us daily, ever going on and continuing its work, till we shall be removed from this state of wretchedness to that of eternal felicity. Each one ought, therefore, to consider Baptism as a daily garment, with which he should always be clothed, that he may ever be found in faith and its fruits, that he may suppress the concupiscence of the old man, and increase in the new. For if we wish to be Christians, we must carry out the work of Baptism, which entitles us to the name of Christians; but if any one falls from it, let him return to it. For as Christ, the mercy-seat, does not retreat or prevent us from coming to him again, although we commit sin, so all his treasures and gifts remain open to our enjoyment. Now, if in Baptism the remission of sin is once obtained, it still continues daily as long as we live, that is, while we are encumbered with the old man.

PART V.

OF THE SACRAMENT OF THE ALTAR.

As we treated the subject of holy Baptism, so we must likewise speak of the other sacrament; namely, of these three parts: *What it is, what it confers, and who should receive it.* And all these are manifested by the words in which it was instituted by Christ, and which every one should know, who wishes to be a Christian, and desires to approach the sacrament of the Lord's Supper. For we are not disposed to permit those to approach the Sacrament, nor to administer it to them, who do not know what they seek there, or why they approach it. The words, however, are these:

"Our Lord Jesus Christ, the night in which he was betrayed, took bread, and when he had given thanks, he brake it, and gave it to his disciples, saying: Take, eat, this is my body, which is given for you. Do this in remembrance of me."

"Likewise after the supper, he took the cup, gave thanks, and gave it to them, saying: Drink ye all of this; this cup is the new testament in my blood, which is shed for you for the remission of sins. Do this, as often as ye drink it, in remembrance of me."

Here also we shall not enter into discussion, nor contend with those who blaspheme and desecrate this sacrament; but we shall *first* consider, as we did with respect to Baptism, on what the power and virtue of this sacrament depend, and show that the principal thing is, the word and ordinance, or command of God; for it was neither devised nor invented by any man, but it was instituted by Christ without the counsel and deliberation of any man. Therefore, as the Ten Commandments, the Lord's Prayer, and the Creed, retain their nature and dignity, even if you never keep, repeat, or believe them; so this venerable sacrament retains its validity, and nothing is impaired or taken from it, even if we do use and treat it unworthily. Do you suppose that God pays such deference to our deeds or faith, as to permit his ordinance and institution to change for such reasons? For we see that in all temporal affairs, every thing remains as God has created and ordered it, in whatever manner we use and treat it. This should always be inculcated; for by this means the murmur of all fanatics can be confounded and silenced; for they view the Sacrament as a work of our own, independent of the Word of God.

What then is the Sacrament of the Altar? Answer:—*It is the*

true body and blood of Christ our Lord, in and with bread and wine, commanded through the words of Christ, for us Christians to eat and to drink. And as we have said concerning Baptism, that it is not simple water, so we also say here, this sacrament is bread and wine, but not mere bread and wine, as taken to the table on other occasions, but bread and wine comprehended in the Word of God and connected with it.

It is the word, I say, that makes and distinguishes this sacrament, so that it is not mere bread and wine, but is, and is called, the body and blood of Christ. For it is said: *Accedat verbum ad elementum, et fit sacramentum*, that is, when the word is added to the external element, it becomes a sacrament. This declaration of St. Augustine is very explicit, and he has scarcely anywhere uttered a more excellent one. The word appropriates the element to the sacrament; if this is not done, it remains a mere element. Now, it is not the word and ordinance or institution of a prince or of an emperor, but the word of the Supreme Majesty; therefore all creatures should prostrate themselves, and acknowledge it to be even as he says, and we should accept it with all honor, fear, and humility.

By this word you can strengthen your conscience, and say: "If a hundred thousand devils, together with all the fanatics, approach, exclaiming, how can bread and wine be the body and blood of Christ, &c., I still know that all these spirits and the learned altogether, are not as wise as the Divine Majesty." Now, here occur the words of Christ: *Take, eat, this is my body; drink ye all of this, this is the new testament in my blood*, &c. To these words we constantly adhere, and we shall see who may presume to overcome Christ, and to use these words otherwise than he has declared them. It is true indeed, if you separate the words from it, or view it apart from the words, there remains nothing but mere bread and wine; but if the words remain with the bread and wine, as they should and must, this sacrament is, agreeably to the words themselves, the true body and blood of Christ. For as the mouth of Christ speaks and declares, so it is, inasmuch as he can neither lie nor deceive.

Hence it is easy to reply to the various questions, about which many are now solicitous; for instance,—whether a wicked priest may handle and administer the Sacrament, and the like? For here we conclude, and assert: Even if a knave receives or administers the Sacrament, he receives the right Sacrament, that is, the body and blood of Christ, as well as he who partakes it in the most reverential and dignified manner; for it is founded, not upon human sanctity, but upon the Word of God; and as no saint on earth, yea, no an-

gel in heaven, can make bread and wine the body and blood of Christ; so likewise no one can alter or change it, even if the Sacrament is misused. The words, through which it became a sacrament, and through which it was instituted, do not become false on account of the unworthiness or unbelief of the person. For he does not say, if you believe or are worthy, you have my body and blood, but, *Take, eat, and drink, this is my body and blood.* Again, *do this*, (namely, this which I now do, institute, give and command you to take,) which is as much as to say: Thank God, whether you be worthy or unworthy, you here have Christ's body and blood by virtue of these words which come to the bread and wine. Mark this, and retain it well; for upon these words depend our grounds, our protection, and defence against all the errors and seductions which have arisen, and which may yet arise.

Thus we have briefly considered the first part that belongs to this sacrament. We shall now consider its virtue and utility, chiefly on account of which the Sacrament was instituted, and which are the most necessary qualities in it; that we may know what we should seek and obtain. Now, this is clear and easy to be understood, even from the words which we have mentioned: *This is my body and blood, given and shed for you for the remission of sins.* The import of these words is briefly this:—We approach the Sacrament in order to receive a treasure, through and in which we obtain the remission of sins. Why do we obtain this? Because the words are employed which give it to us; for he commands me to eat and to drink, in order that it may be mine and be beneficial to me, as a sure pledge and a sign: yea, to receive even this blessing which was set apart for me, against my sins, my death, and every evil.

It is, therefore, very appropriately called food for the soul, which nourishes and strengthens the new man; for through Baptism we are born anew, but beside this, the old vicious nature in the flesh and blood nevertheless adheres to man, in which there are so many impediments and obstacles, with which we are opposed as well by the devil as by the world, so that we often become weary and faint, and sometimes stumble.

This sacrament is, therefore, given as daily food and nourishment, by which faith may repair and recover its strength, so that it may not fall back in this contest, but increase in strength. For the new life must be so regulated as continually to increase and progress. On the other hand, it has much to endure; for the devil is an enemy so malignant, that if he perceives us opposing him and attacking the old man, if he cannot defeat us by force, he wearies us by lurk-

ing about on all sides, trying all his arts without ceasing, so that, either permitting our faith to decline, or our physical powers to fail, we become dull and impatient. This consolation then is given for this purpose, that when the heart feels these things becoming too oppressive for it, it can here obtain new strength and refreshment.

But our wise spirits, who cry out vociferously, "How can bread and wine forgive sins or strengthen faith?" pervert our meaning with their strange erudition and wisdom, when at the same time they hear and know that we do not say this bread and wine,—as bread in itself is bread,—but of such bread and wine as are the body and blood of Christ,* and such as are connected with the words: this and no other, I say, is the treasure indeed, through which this forgiveness of sins is obtained. Now it is indeed not otherwise applied and appropriated to us, than in these words, *given and shed for you*; for in these words it is said both that it is the body and blood of Christ, and that it is yours as a treasure and a gift. Now the body of Christ cannot be a fruitless, vain thing, accomplishing nothing and affording no benefit. As great, however, as the treasure is in itself, it must be embraced, and administered to us, in the word, otherwise we could never be able either to seek it, or to have any knowledge of it.

Therefore their assertion is frivolous, when they say, "That the body and blood of Christ are not given and shed for us in the Eucharist, and that for this reason we cannot obtain the forgiveness of sins in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper." For, although this work was accomplished on the Cross, and the remission of sins obtained, yet they cannot be communicated to us otherwise than through the word; for how could we otherwise know that these things had been accomplished, or that they are presented to us, if they are not handed down to us through the Word? From what source do they know it, or how can they apprehend the remission of sins, and apply it to themselves, if they do not support themselves by, and believe in the Scripture and the Gospel? Now indeed the whole Gospel, and the article of the Creed,—*I believe in a holy Christian church, forgiveness of sins, &c.*,—by virtue of the word, are embraced in this sacrament, and presented to us. Why then should we permit this treasure to be torn away from this sacrament, when at the same time they must acknowledge, that even these words are those which we hear every where in the Gospel? And in truth, as little can they affirm that these words in the Sacrament are of no

* See note on this subject, page 384.

benefit, as they dare to affirm that the whole Gospel or the Word of God, apart from the Sacrament, is of no benefit.

Thus, then, we have the whole doctrine of the Sacrament, both what it is in itself, and the benefits it confers. Now we must also consider *who the person is* that experiences this efficacy and benefit. To show this in the briefest manner, we say, as we did in reference to Baptism, that whoever believes this, receives what the words declare and offer. For they are not declared and revealed to wood and stone, but to those who hear them, and to whom he says, *Take and eat*. And since he offers and promises forgiveness of sins, it cannot be received otherwise than through faith. Such faith he himself requires in these words, when he says, *Given for you, and shed for you*; as if he should say, I give you my body and blood, and bid you eat and drink, in order that you may embrace and enjoy them. Now whoever permits this to be declared to him, and believes it to be true, enjoys it; but whoever does not believe, receives no benefit, inasmuch as he allows it to be presented to him in vain, and desires not to enjoy this salutary blessing. This treasure is indeed set apart and placed before the door, yea, upon the table, for all; but you are required to embrace it, and firmly to believe what the words declare it to be.

Now this is the whole Christian preparation for receiving this sacrament worthily. For since this treasure is wholly presented to us in the words, it cannot be apprehended and applied otherwise than by the heart; for we cannot lay hold on this gift and eternal treasure with our hands. Fasting and prayer, may indeed be an external preparation and exercise for the young, to enable them to conduct and demean themselves modestly and reverently towards the body and blood of Christ; but that which is given in and through this sacrament, the body cannot apprehend and appropriate, but the faith of the heart does it, which perceives and desires this treasure. Let this suffice, being as much as is necessary for general instruction concerning this sacrament; for whatever is necessary further to be said in reference to it, belongs to another occasion.

Finally, inasmuch as we now have the right sense and true doctrine of this sacrament, an admonition and exhortation are also highly necessary, lest we should neglect this great treasure which is daily administered and distributed among Christians; that is, that those who wish to be Christians, should accustom themselves to receive this highly venerable sacrament frequently. For we see that persons are careless and dilatory about this matter; and the greater portion of those who hear the Gospel,—since the frivolous opinions

of the Pope are removed, in consequence of which we are liberated from his constraint and authority,—pass indeed a year or two, or even longer, without the Sacrament, as if they were Christians so strong as not to need it; and some allow themselves to be prevented and deterred from it, because we have taught that no one should approach, unless feeling a hunger and thirst which urge him. Others maintain that it is free and unnecessary, and that it is sufficient if they believe in other respects; and thus the greater part lose all devotion and affection for the Sacrament, becoming entirely rude, and finally hold in contempt both the Sacrament and the Word of God.

Now it is true, as we have said, that no one should by any means be forced or compelled to approach the Sacrament, lest we should again establish a new inquisition. Yet it should, however, be known that those persons who keep away and abstain from the Sacrament so long a time, are not to be held as Christians; for Christ did not institute it to be used as a mere spectacle, but he commanded his Christians to eat and to drink it, remembering him through it.

And in truth those who are true Christians, and hold this sacrament dear and precious, should really force themselves to it; yet, for the purpose of inducing the inexperienced and the weak, who also wish to be Christians, the more to consider the reasons and necessities which should urge them to receive the Sacrament, we shall make a few remarks on the subject. For, as in other matters touching faith, love, and patience, it is not enough to teach and to instruct only, but also to admonish daily; and so here it is necessary to continue preaching, so that we may not become careless and averse to this matter, since we know and feel how the devil always strives against this and every Christian exercise, and, as far as he is able, drives and forces away from it as many as he can.

And in the first place, we have an expressive text in the words of Christ, *Do this in remembrance of me*. These are the words of a command, by which it is enjoined on those who wish to be Christians to partake of this sacrament. For this reason, whoever wishes to be a disciple of Christ, to whom he here speaks, let him reflect, and adhere to the requirements of these words, not through constraint, as being forced by men, but through obedience and to the honor of Christ. But perhaps you may say, these words *As oft as ye do it*, stand here in connection; here he forces no one, but leaves it to the freedom of his choice. Reply:—This is true, but they do not say, that we should *never* do it. Yes, since he declares even these words: *As oft as ye do it*, it is implied that it is to be done often; and more than this, he wishes the Sacrament to

be free,—not confined to a particular time like the Jewish Passover, which they were compelled to eat but once each year, invariably on the evening of the fourteenth day of the first full moon,—as if he would say, I institute for you a paschal festival, or a supper, which you shall enjoy, not only on the anniversary of this evening, but *often*, when and where you wish, according to the opportunity and necessity of each one, confined to no particular place or fixed time. And yet the Pope afterwards perverted it, and made out of it a Jewish festival.

Thus you perceive, that there is not such an extent of liberty left as to allow us to condemn the Sacrament. For if a person, having nothing to prevent him, still never desires and always neglects to receive the Sacrament, this I regard as condemning it. If you wish to have this liberty, then assume even so much as not to be a Christian, and you need neither believe nor pray; for the one is equally as well the injunction of Christ as the other. But if you wish to be a Christian, you must at least occasionally act up to the requirements of this command, and be obedient to it; for this command should, indeed, move you to examine yourself, and to ask: “Behold, what kind of a Christian am I? If I were a Christian, I would endeavor to do that which my Lord has commanded me to do.”

And in truth, since we conduct ourselves so strangely in reference to the sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, it is easy to perceive what kind of Christians we were under the Papacy, as these approached it through the fear and constraint of human commands, without love and desire, and had no respect for the command of Christ; but we neither force nor violently compel any one to approach, nor should any do it for our gratification. This fact itself, that Christ requires it and that it is pleasing to him, should, however, induce and urge you to it. We should not allow ourselves to be forced either to faith, or to good works of any kind, by men. We do nothing more than tell you and admonish you of what you should do, not for our sake, but for your own. Christ calls you, and encourages you; if you will reject this call with contempt, then answer for it yourself.

The first thing necessary then, especially for those who are cold and negligent, is for them to reflect seriously and to awake. For this is undoubtedly true,—as I have indeed experienced in myself, and as every one will discover in himself,—that if we thus separate ourselves from the enjoyment of the Sacrament, we daily become the more careless and cold, and finally neglect it altogether. But if the Eucharist is more frequently used, we may examine our hearts and our consciences, and conduct ourselves as persons who sincerely de-

sire to be in favor with God : yes, the more frequently we enjoy it the more the heart is warmed and animated, so that it may not grow entirely cold.

But if you ask,—What then, if I feel that I am unfit to receive the Sacrament ? Answer :—This feeling troubles me too, resulting especially from the old impression made by the teachings of the Pope, under whom we tormented ourselves to a very great degree, in order that we might become entirely pure, and that God might not discover the slightest imperfection in us ; in consequence of which we felt so intimidated, that every one immediately became alarmed, and said : “ O, alas ! I am unworthy.” For human nature and reason begin to estimate our worthiness in comparison with this great and precious blessing : here they find themselves as an obscure lantern compared with the meridian sun, or as dust with precious stone ; and because they feel this, they are unwilling to approach the Sacrament, deferring it until they become fit, to such a length of time, that one week brings on another, and one half year another. But if you wish to take into consideration your piety and purity, and to strive after these, so that nothing may disturb you, you can never approach the Sacrament.

Therefore we should make a distinction here between persons. For those who are intractable and obstinate, we should advise to abstain from the Sacrament ; for they are not prepared to receive the remission of sins, having no desire for it, and not wishing to be pious. But others who are not so rude and dissolute, and who earnestly desire that they might be pious, should not be absent from the Lord’s Supper, even if they are otherwise weak and defective, even as St. Hilary has said : “ If a sin is not committed in such a way that the perpetrator can be justly excluded from the congregation, and regarded as a heathen, he should not stay away from the Sacrament, so that he may not deprive himself of life.” For no one will arrive at such a degree of perfection, as not to have daily defects in his flesh and blood.

For this reason, such persons should learn that the greatest wisdom is to know that the Sacrament does not depend on our worthiness ; for we do not permit ourselves to be baptized, as being meritorious and holy ; nor do we confess our sins, as being pure and sinless ; but on the contrary, we confess as being poor and miserable, and even because we are undeserving ; yet, if any one should neither desire grace nor absolution, nor think of amending his ways, he is unworthy to approach the Sacrament. But whoever desires to have grace and consolation, should urge himself, allowing

no one to deter him from it ; and he should say : “ I would truly desire to be worthy, but I approach, not upon the merit of any worthiness, but upon the authority of thy word,—because thou hast commanded it,—as one who desires to be thy disciple, let my worthiness remain where it can.” But this is a difficult and a grave resolution ; for the fact that we look more upon ourselves than upon the word and voice of Christ, continually lies in our way, and impedes us. For human nature ardently wishes so to act that it may firmly rely and depend on itself ; if frustrated in this attempt, it will not approach. Let this suffice in reference to the first part.

In the second place, besides this command there is also a promise, as we have seen above, which should most forcibly incite and urge us. For here stand the gracious and lovely words : *This is my body, given for you : this is my blood, shed for you for the remission of sins.* These words, I have said, are preached, not to wood or stone, but to me and you ; otherwise he might as well have remained silent, and instituted no sacrament. Reflect, then, and include yourself also in these words (*for you*), so that he may not speak unto you in vain.

For here he offers unto us the whole treasure which he brought from heaven for us ; and besides, he also invites us in the most friendly manner ; as for instance, in Matt. 11, 28, where he says : “ Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest.” Now it is indeed a sin and a shame, since he so lovingly and fervently calls and admonishes us to our highest and best good, that we conduct ourselves so strangely towards it, and go on from time to time, until we become entirely cold and hardened, and have neither desire nor love for it. We must indeed not look upon the Sacrament as an injurious thing, from which we should flee ; but as a pure and salutary medicine, which benefits us and gives us life, both in our souls and bodies. For where the soul is renovated, the body is also benefitted.* Why then do we act in reference to the Sacrament as if it were a poison in which we eat death ?

It is true, indeed, that those who condemn it and live inconsistent with the principles of Christianity, receive it to their injury and condemnation ; for to them nothing shall be good and wholesome, even as a patient who, through his wantonness, eats and drinks that which is forbidden him by the physician. But those who feel their weakness, who desire to be freed from it, and wish to obtain help, should not view it or use it otherwise than as a precious antidote against

* Namely, because the tranquillity and serenity of the mind exert an influence also on the body.

the poison with which they are infected. For here in the Sacrament you should receive from the mouth of Christ the remission of sins, with which is connected and conferred the grace of God, and the Spirit with all his gifts, his defence, protection, and power against death, the devil, and every calamity.

Thus, by the grace of God, you have both the command and the promise of Christ our Lord, to which your own necessity, which encumbers you, should bind you, and for the sake of which this invitation, this command, and these promises are given. For he says himself: "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick," Matt. 9, 12; that is, those who labor and are oppressed with sin, with the fear of death, and the temptations of the flesh and of the devil. Now, if you are oppressed with sin, and feel your weakness, approach the Lord's Supper with cheerfulness, and be refreshed, consoled, and strengthened. If you wish to defer it till you are freed from sin and imperfection, that you may approach the Sacrament worthy and pure, you can never approach it. For here Christ passes the sentence, saying:—If you are pure and pious, you have no need of me, nor do I require any thing from you. For this reason, those alone are unworthy, who neither feel their defects, nor wish to be regarded as sinners.

But if you ask, What then shall I do in this case, if I can neither feel this necessity, nor experience any hunger and thirst for the Sacrament? Answer:—I know no better advice for those who are so disposed as not to feel these, than for them to look into their own hearts, and see whether they have also flesh and blood; and if they discover this, then they will be benefitted by turning to St. Paul's Epistle to the Galatians, ch. 5, vs. 19, 20, 21, and hearing what the fruits of their flesh are: "Manifest are the works of the flesh," says he, "which are *these*: adultery, fornication, uncleanness, lasciviousness, idolatry, witchcraft, hatred, variance, emulation, wrath, strife, seditions, heresies, envyings, murders, drunkenness, revellings, and such like." If, therefore, you are not conscious of these, then believe the Scripture at least, which will not deceive you, since it is better acquainted with your flesh than you are. Yes, further St. Paul, Rom. 7, 18, concludes: "For I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." Now if St. Paul dares to declare this with respect to his own flesh, surely we should not presume to be better and more holy. But the very fact that we do not feel these necessities, is so much the worse; for it is an indication of a leprosy raging in and corroding the flesh, though we remain insensible to it. Nevertheless, as said, if you are so entirely destitute

of feeling, believe the Scripture still, which passes the sentence against you. And in a word, the less you feel your sins and infirmities, the more reason you have to approach, in order to seek help and relief.

Again, look around you, and see whether you are also *in the world*, and if you are ignorant of it, inquire of your neighbors; if you are in the world, think not that you will be free from wants and from sins. For only begin, and act as if you wished to become pious and to adhere to the Gospel, and see if no one will be at enmity with you, or do you injury, injustice, and violence; and moreover, give you cause for sin and iniquity. If you have not experienced it, then let the Scripture declare it to you, which every where attributes this character to the world, and bears this testimony of it.

You will, in truth, be encompassed by the devil also, whom you will not be able to overcome entirely, since Christ our Lord himself could not avoid his temptations. What then is the devil? Nothing else but as the Scripture calls him, a liar and a murderer—a liar, who misleads the heart from the Word of God, and blinds it, so that you cannot feel your want, nor approach Christ—a murderer, who envies every hour of your existence. If you should see how many daggers, spears, and fiery darts are aimed at you every moment, you would be glad to approach the Sacrament as often as possible. But our secure and careless progress results from not considering or believing that we are in the flesh, in a wicked world, or under the kingdom of Satan.

Therefore, try and exercise this resource carefully; turn but to your own heart, examine yourself a little, and only compare yourself with the Scripture. If you still feel nothing, you have the more need to complain, both to God and your brother, permitting yourself to be advised, and supplications to be made in your behalf; and do not cease until the adamant is removed from your heart. Then the necessity will discover itself, and you will be assured that you are more deeply involved in sin, than many other poor sinners, and that you have much more need of the Sacrament against this wretchedness, which alas! you cannot see, unless God grants his grace, that you may feel it the more sensibly, and be the more desirous of receiving the Sacrament; especially, since the devil assails and incessantly pursues you, wherever he can overtake you and ruin soul and body, so that you cannot be secure a single hour on account of him. How soon might he have plunged you into misfortune and wretchedness, when you were least on your guard!

Now these remarks are made as an admonition, not only for the

aged and the experienced, but also for the young, whom we should train up in the knowledge of the Christian doctrines. For by this means, we could the more easily impress upon the minds of the young, the Ten Commandments, the Creed, and the Lord's Prayer, so that they might receive them with earnestness and gratitude, and thus be trained and accustomed to them from their infancy. For such is the condition of the old now, that these and other doctrines cannot be preserved, unless we instruct those who are to succeed us and to enter into our offices and labors, so that they may rear up their children also in a proper manner, by which the Word of God and Christianity may be preserved. Let every father of a family know, then, that he is under obligation by the order and command of God, to teach, or to suffer his children to be taught, those things with which they ought to be acquainted. For, since they are baptized, and taken into the Christian community, they should also enjoy this communion of the Sacrament, so as to become serviceable and useful to us; for they must all tender us their aid in believing, loving, praying, and in striving against the devil.

A BRIEF ADMONITION TO CONFESSION.*

In reference to Confession, we have ever taught that it should be free, that the tyranny of the Pope should be put down, and that we should be liberated from all his constraints, and relieved from the intolerable burdens imposed on the Christian community. For hitherto, as we have all experienced, nothing has been more grievous than the compulsion of every one to confession, at the hazard of incurring the highest displeasure. And this, moreover, was so very

*“In reference to this Appendix as an admonition to confession,—it is wanting in the oldest Wittenburg edition of the Larger Catechism, as well as in the *corpp. doctrinae* of Thuringia, Julia, and Brunswick, and also in the edition of the writings of Luther, vol. 4, published at Jena; the reason of which seems to have been, because Luther himself did not subjoin it in the first edition, but added it at a later date. This appears to be very probable from the fact that in the commencement he appeals to his general doctrine concerning liberty of confession; and by this, very probably, he has reference to various passages in both Catechisms and to his other writings, and particularly to the Articles of Smalcald composed by him, in which most of it occurs. Hence this addition may, at first indeed, have been attached to the Catechism about the time of the entire collection of the Book of Concord, since it is also found added to the Larger Catechism in the edition of his works, vol. 6, published at Wittenburg in 1570. From these facts as well as from the general character of this addition, it is evident that it was not at all designed as a component part or a necessary appendage to the Symbolical Books; but merely as a closer and clearer exposition of the article con-

burdensome, and the consciences of men were tormented to such a degree with the enumeration of so many kinds of sins, that no one could confess fully enough; and what was the worst, no one taught or knew what confession was, or the benefit and consolation resulting from it, but made of it nothing but anguish and fiendish torture, we being compelled to submit to it, when at the same time there was nothing to which we were more averse. We are now favored by proper instruction on these points, that we are permitted to make our confession through no constraint or fear, and are relieved of the torments resulting from so close an enumeration of all sins; and besides, we have the advantage to know how we may happily use it to the consolation and strengthening of our consciences.

But all men are inclined to this, and have, indeed, too readily learned to do that in which they delight, and thus assume to themselves the liberty as if they had no obligation or necessity to confess. For that which meets our approbation we soon embrace, and it is easily imbibed, where the Gospel operates gently and mildly. But such creatures, I have said, ought not to be under the Gospel, nor enjoy any of its blessings; but they should remain under the Pope, and suffer themselves to be coerced and tormented, so as to be compelled to confess, fast, &c., more than before. For whoever will neither believe the Gospel nor live according to it, and do that which it is the duty of a Christian to perform, should likewise not enjoy its blessings. What would it be, if you wished to have enjoyment only, and would neither add nor contribute any thing to it? For this reason we would have nothing preached to such persons; and by our consent, we would permit none of our liberty to be shared or enjoyed by them, but suffer the Pope or his representative to reign over them again, who would constrain them like a real tyrant; for nothing else belongs to that order of men, who will not be obedient to the Gospel, but a task-master who is God's avenger and executioner. But to others who freely permit themselves to be informed,

cerning confession, and as a common warning against the abuse of this doctrine. So that, even for this reason indeed, the continuation of this piece may be allowed among the Symbolical Books; but in this respect it is left entirely arbitrary, since it cannot be properly regarded as a part of the Symbolical Books. Hence it is not found in the Dresden, Tibbing, Frankford, Stuttgard, Heidelberg, Leipsic, and other editions, nor in the Latin Concordia; and under the view mentioned above, it was received into the quarto edition of the Book of Concord published at Magdeburg in 1580, and in several editions of the Catechism, and among these in the new Arnold edition." See Dr. Baumgarten's Christian Book of Concord, published by Gebauer, at Halle, in 1747, page 799.

we must ever preach, encouraging, inciting, and entreating them not to suffer that precious and consolatory treasure, which is presented through the Gospel, to pass in vain. We shall, therefore, say something also in reference to *Confession*, for the purpose of instructing and admonishing the inexperienced.

In the first place, I have said that besides this confession, concerning which we here speak, there are two kinds of confession, which might rather be called a common confession for all Christians; namely, that in which we confess to God alone, or to our neighbor alone, and ask for remission,—acknowledgements which are also implied in the Lord's Prayer, where we say: *Forgive us our trespases, as we forgive those who trespass against us.* Yes, the whole of this Prayer is nothing else than such a confession; for what is our prayer, but that we confess our wants and the neglect of that which it is our duty to perform, desiring grace and a peaceful conscience? Such confession shall and must be made without omission, while we live; for in this, especially, consists the character of a Christian, that we acknowledge ourselves to be sinners, and pray for grace.

In like manner the other confession, in which each one acknowledges before his neighbor, is also included in the Lord's Prayer, namely, where we confess and forgive trespasses among each other, before we approach God and ask for remission. Now, all of us are guilty; hence we should and may with propriety confess publicly, without fearing one another; for no one is pious, and no one performs his duty towards God or his neighbor; yet besides this general, there is also a particular guilt,—where one has provoked another to anger, on account of which he should ask his pardon. Consequently, in the Lord's Prayer, we have two absolutions, namely, for sins committed against God, and for sins committed against our neighbor, which are forgiven us if we forgive our neighbor and reconcile ourselves with him.

Besides this useful, daily, and open confession, there is also a confession which may take place privately between two brothers. And if, from some special cause, we become disturbed with restless anxiety, and find our faith insufficient, we can make our complaint to a brother in this private confession, and obtain his advice, comfort, and support, whenever we desire. For this confession is not embraced in a command, like the other two, but it is left optional with every one who needs it, to use it to his necessity. And it derives its origin and authority from the fact that Christ himself has placed and committed the absolution into the mouth of his Christian community, to release us from sins. Now wherever there is a heart which

feels its sins and desires consolation, it has here an unfailing resource in the Word of God, that God through a human being releases and acquits it of sins.

Thus observe then, as I have frequently said, that confession comprises two parts. The first is *our* work and act, to deplore our sins and desire consolation and renovation of soul. The other is a work of *God*, who through the word, in the mouth of man, absolves me from my sins, which is the chief and most valuable thing, rendering it desirable and consolatory. Now hitherto *our* work alone was insisted upon, and no further thought was indulged but for us to confess fully indeed; but the other most essential part was neither regarded nor preached; precisely as if it were only a good work, with which we might compensate God; and that unless confession were made perfectly and in the most accurate manner, absolution would avail nothing, and our sins would not be forgiven. By this means the people were driven to such excess that every one had to despair of confessing so fully, (which was impossible,) and no conscience was able to be at peace, or to depend on this absolution. Thus they have rendered this desirable confession not only useless to us, but severe and grievous, to the evident injury and ruin of souls.

For this reason we should so view confession as to distinguish and separate these two parts far from each other, and esteem our own work as insignificant; but the Word of God we should esteem as great and exalted; and we should not enter upon our confession as if we wished to perform a precious work, and make a contribution to God,—but to obtain and receive something from him. You need not come and declare how pious or wicked you are; if you are a Christian, I know it well enough otherwise; if you are none, I know it still more readily. But it is to be done, in order that you may lament your wants, and obtain help, a joyful heart, and a peaceful conscience.

No one is allowed to force you to confession by authority; but we say, whoever is a Christian, or freely wishes to be one, has an impressive admonition here, to enter upon his confession, and obtain the precious treasure. If you are no Christian, or do not desire this consolation, we shall let some one else compel you. By this means we abolish altogether the Pope's tyrannical authority, which is nowhere to be tolerated; for, as said, we teach that whoever does not go to confession willingly and for the sake of absolution, should omit it. Yes, whoever presumes, on account of the purity of his confession, to rely on his own work, no matter how pure and excellent he may have made his confession, let him abstain from it. But we admonish you to confess and make known your wants, not in order

to perform it as a work, but to hear what God permits to be declared to you; the word, I say, or the absolution, you should consider, and esteem great and precious, receiving it with all due honor and gratitude, as an excellent and valuable treasure.

Should we illustrate this, and in connection with it exhibit the necessity which should urge and impel us to the confession of our sins, we would need but little compulsion or constraint; our own conscience would truly urge each one, and so alarm him, that he would be glad of the opportunity to confess his sins; and he would embrace it like a poor indigent beggar, when he hears that at a certain place a rich distribution of money and clothing is made: here there is no need for a beadle to urge and to force him; he would indeed run of himself with whatever speed his physical powers would allow, lest he should fail in securing these benefits. Now, if we were to enjoin a command respecting it, that all beggars must run thither, insisting on this alone, and keeping silent in reference to what should be sought and obtained there, how could it be otherwise than that they would approach with reluctance, not expecting to obtain any thing there, but to be exposed in their poverty and imperfection? From this there would be but little enjoyment and consolation derived, but they would become only the more hostile to this injunction, as if it were imposed upon them for reproach and derision, compelling them to let their poverty and wretchedness be seen.

Even so the legates of the Pope have hitherto remained silent with respect to this rich and excellent privilege and inexpressible treasure, forcing multitudes to confession for no other purpose than to expose our impurity and pollution. Who, under these circumstances, could go to confession with cheerfulness? We do not say, however, that people must see how full of pollution you are, and thus contrast themselves with you; but that they should advise you, and say: "If you are poor and wretched, come, and use this salutary remedy." Now whoever feels his want and wretchedness, will indeed experience such a desire for confession, that he will attend to it with pleasure; but those who do not regard it or come of themselves, we suffer to take their own course; but this they must know, that we do not regard them as Christians.

Thus then we teach how excellent, how precious, and consolatory confession is; we admonish, moreover, that this precious treasure should not be held in contempt, but be regarded as highly necessary. Now if you are a Christian, you need neither my constraint nor the Pope's command, but you will indeed importune, and entreat me, that you may become a participant in it. But if you despise it, and go on se-

haughtily without confessing, we conclude that you are no Christian, and that you should also not enjoy the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; for you despise that which no Christian should despise, and by this means render it impossible for you to have remission of sins. It is a sure indication too that you hold the Gospel in contempt.

In a word, we would know of no constraint; but we have nothing to do with those who neither hear nor obey our preaching and admonition; nor shall they enjoy any of the privileges of the Gospel. If you were a Christian, you should be glad to embrace the opportunity of going even a hundred miles or more to discharge the duty, and not permit yourself to be compelled, but come and urge us to hear your confession. For here the constraint must be reversed, so that we are subjected to the command, and you be vested with the liberty; we force no one, but permit ourselves to be urged, even as we are constrained to preach, and to administer the sacraments.

When we admonish to confession, therefore, we do nothing else but admonish every one to become a Christian; if I succeed in bringing you to this, I have also brought you to confession. For those who long to be pious Christians, to be free from their sins, and to have joyful consciences, have the right hunger and thirst already, eagerly to grasp this bread even as the hart when pursued, and wearied with heat and thirst, as the 42d Psalm, verse 1, says: "As the hart panteth after the water-brooks, so panteth my soul after thee, O God." That is, as longing and anxious as the hart is after the fresh streams, so anxious and concerned am I about God's Word or absolution and the Sacrament. Behold, this is correct teaching concerning confession; thus we should create a love and desire for it, so that people would come to it, and solicit us more than we might wish or desire. We shall let the Papists plague and torment themselves and other people who do not esteem this treasure, and debar themselves from it; but let us lift up our hands, and praise and thank God, that we have arrived at this knowledge and grace. Amen.

FORMULA OF CONCORD.

FORMULA OF CONCORD.

PART I.

EPITOME;

OR

SUMMARY OF THE ARTICLES, CONCERNING WHICH CONTROVERSIES HAVE ARISEN AMONG
THE THEOLOGIAN'S OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, AND WHICH ARE IN THE
FOLLOWING REPETITION EXPLAINED AND ADJUSTED IN A CHRISTIAN
MANNER, ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE WORD OF GOD.

OF THE COMPENDIOUS RULE AND STANDARD, ACCORDING TO WHICH
ALL DOCTRINES ARE TO BE JUDGED, AND THE CONTROVERSIES
WHICH HAVE ARISEN, ARE TO BE SET FORTH AND DETERMINED IN
A CHRISTIAN MANNER.

1. We believe, teach, and confess, that the only rule and standard, according to which all doctrines and teachers alike ought to be tried and judged, are the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments alone, as it is written, Psalm 119, 105: "Thy word is a lamp unto my feet, and a light unto my path." And St. Paul, Gal. 1, 8, says: "Though an angel from heaven preach any other Gospel unto you than that which we have preached unto you, let him be accursed."

Other writings, however, of ancient and modern teachers, whatever their reputation may be, shall not be held to be of equal authority with the holy Scripture, but to be subordinate to it, and shall not be received otherwise or further than as witnesses respecting the manner in which such doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, was held in certain places, after the age of the Apostles.

2. And as, immediately after the time of the Apostles, and even while they were yet living, false teachers and heretics arose, against whom Symbols, that is, short, plain confessions, were drawn up in the first churches, which were unanimously held as the universal Christian faith and confession of the orthodox and true churches, namely, the Apostolic Symbol, the Nicene Symbol, and the Atha-

nasian Symbol; we publicly acknowledge these, and hereby reject all heresies and doctrines, which, in opposition to these, have been introduced into the church of God.

3. But so far as it pertains to the divisions in matters of faith, which have arisen in our day, we regard as the unanimous expression and declaration of our Christian faith and confession,—particularly in opposition to the Papacy and its false methods of worship, its idolatry, and its superstition, as well as to other sects,—the symbol of our time, the original, unaltered Augsburg Confession, delivered to the Emperor Charles V. at Augsburg, in the year 1530, at the great Diet; together with the Apology of the same, and the Articles drawn up at Smalcald, in the year 1537, and subscribed by the most eminent theologians at that time.

And inasmuch as these matters also concern all laymen, and the salvation of their souls, we also acknowledge the Smaller and Larger Catechisms of Dr. Luther, in the form in which both these Catechisms occur in the writings of Luther, as a species of *bible* of the laity, comprising all that is treated of copiously in the holy Scriptures, and all that it is necessary for a Christian to know for his salvation.

According to the abovementioned principles, all doctrines must be conformed, and that which is contrary to them, must be rejected and condemned, as being repugnant to the unanimous declaration of our faith.

In this manner the difference between the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments and all other writings, will be preserved, and the holy Scriptures alone will remain as the sole judge, rule, and standard, according to which, as the only touchstone, all doctrines shall and must be understood and judged whether they be good or evil, right or wrong.

But the other symbols and writings mentioned above, are not authorities like the holy Scriptures; but they are only a testimony and explanation of our faith, showing the manner in which at any time the holy Scriptures were understood and explained by those who then lived, in respect to articles that had been controverted in the church of God, and also the grounds on which doctrines that were opposed to the holy Scriptures, had been rejected and condemned.

I. OF ORIGINAL SIN.

The chief question in this controversy.

Whether original sin is properly, and without any distinction, the corrupt nature, substance, and essence of man, or at least the principal and noblest part of his being, namely, the rational soul itself in its highest faculties and powers? Or, whether there is a difference between the substance, nature, being, body, and soul of man, even after the fall, and original sin, so that the nature of man, on the one hand, and, on the other, original sin which clings to this corrupt nature and depraves it, are two distinct things?

AFFIRMATIVE.

Pure doctrine, faith, and confession, according to the above-mentioned rule and compendious explanation.

1. We believe, teach, and confess, that there is a difference between the nature of man, not only as he was created by God in the beginning, pure, holy, and without sin, but also as we now find his nature since the fall, that is to say, between nature itself, which even after the fall is and remains a creature of God, and original sin; and that this difference between nature and original sin, is as great as the difference between the work of God, and that of Satan.

2. We also believe, teach, and confess, that this distinction is to be most diligently observed, because the doctrine, that there can be no difference between our corrupt nature and original sin, militates against the chief articles of our Christian faith, concerning creation, redemption, sanctification, and the resurrection of the body, and is irreconcilable with them.

For God created not only the bodies and souls of Adam and Eve before the fall, but also our bodies and souls since the fall, though they are now corrupt; and God acknowledges them still as his work, as it is written, Job 10, 8: "Thine hands have made me, and fashioned me together round about." (Deut. 32, 18; Isa. 45, 9, sqq.; 54, 5; 64, 8; Acts 17, 28; Job 10, 8; Psalm 100, 3; 139, 14; Eccles. 12, 1.)

The Son of God also in the unity of his person, assumed this human nature, yet without sin, and by taking our own flesh and not that of others, he became in this respect our true brother, Heb. 2, 14: "Forasmuch then as the children are partakers of flesh and

blood, he also himself likewise took part of the same." Again, verses 16 and 17: "He took not on him the nature of angels: but he took on him the seed of Abraham. Wherefore in all things," sin excepted, "it behooved him to be made like unto his brethren." Thus has Christ redeemed our human nature as his work, he sanctifies it as his work, raises it from the dead, and adorns it with glory as his work; but he neither created, assumed, redeemed, or sanctified original sin, nor will he raise it up, or adorn or save it in the elect, but in the resurrection it will be entirely abolished.

Hence the distinction between our corrupt nature, on the one hand, and that corruption, on the other, which clings to nature, and through which nature became corrupt, can be easily perceived.

3. We believe, teach, and confess, however, on the other hand, that original sin is not a superficial, but so deep a corruption of human nature that nothing sound or uncorrupt remains in the body and soul of man, his internal and external powers; according to one of the hymns of the church:

"This human frame, this soul, this all,
Is all corrupt through Adam's fall."

This unspeakably great injury cannot be ascertained by our reason, but is to be learned from the Word of God alone; and we hold that such corruption of our nature, cannot be separated from nature itself by any one but God alone,—which separation through death, is completed in the resurrection, when our nature, which we now bear, shall rise and live eternally, released and separated from original sin; as it is written, Job. 19, 26, 27: "And though, after my skin, worms destroy this body, yet in my flesh shall I see God: whom I shall see for myself, and mine eyes shall behold, and not another."

NEGATIVE.

Rejection of contrary and false doctrines.

1. Accordingly we reject and condemn the doctrine which asserts, that original sin is only a *reatus*, guilt, or a debt derived from the offence of another, without any corruption of our own nature.

2. Likewise that evil lusts are not sin, but concreated and essential properties of nature; or that those defects and that evil mentioned above, are not truly a sin on account of which man, when not united with Christ, becomes a child of wrath.

3. In like manner we reject also the Pelagian error, according to

which it is alledged, that the nature of man even after the fall, was uncorrupt, and that it remained entirely good and pure in its natural powers, especially as to spiritual things.

4. Likewise that original sin is only a slight, exterior, unimportant blemish, or a mere spot adhering to nature, in connection with which, nevertheless, nature still retained, even in spiritual matters, its good, unimpaired powers.

5. Likewise, that original sin is only an external impediment of our good, unimpaired spiritual powers, and not a despoliation or want of these powers; as when a magnet is overspread with garlic-juice, through which its natural power is not taken away, but only obstructed; or that this spot can be washed away as easily as a spot on the face, or paint on the wall.

6. Likewise, that the nature and essence of man are not entirely corrupted, but that he still retains something good in himself, even in spiritual things, as for instance, the ability, aptness, capacity or power to make a commencement, to work or to co-operate, in spiritual things.

7. We also reject, on the other hand, the false doctrine of the Manicheans, namely, that original sin, as something essential and subsisting of itself, was infused into our nature by Satan, and intermingled with it, as poison and wine may be mingled together.

8. Likewise, that it is not the natural man himself, but some other and foreign thing in man which sins; and that therefore, not nature itself, but original sin existing in nature, is accused.

9. We reject and condemn also, as a Manichean error, the doctrine that original sin is properly, and without any distinction, the substance, nature, and essence itself of corrupt man, so that no difference between the corrupted nature in itself since the fall, and original sin, can be conceived of, or that the former cannot be distinguished from the latter, even in our thoughts.

10. This original sin, however, is called by Luther, natural, personal, or essential sin; not as if the nature, person, or essence itself of man, without any difference, is original sin, but in order that the difference between original sin, which adheres to human nature, and other sins which are called actual sins, may be better shown.

11. For original sin is not a sin which we commit, but it adheres to the nature, substance, and essence of man; so that, if even no evil thought should ever arise in the heart of corrupt man, no idle word be spoken, no evil deed be done, still the nature of man is corrupted through original sin, which is congenital, and is itself a fountain-head of all other or actual sins, such as evil thoughts,

words, and deeds; as it is written, Matt. 15, 19: "Out of the heart proceed evil thoughts;" and again, Gen. 6, 5: "Every imagination of the thoughts of" man's "heart is only evil continually."

12. The various significations of the word *nature*, by means of which the Manicheans conceal their delusion, and lead many unlearned persons into error, should also be carefully considered. For sometimes it signifies man himself, (his essence, substance or being,) as when it is said, God created human nature; at other times, however, it signifies the character, the defects or evils which belong to the very nature of any thing, as when it is said, "It is the nature of the serpent to sting," or, "Sin, or to sin, is man's nature;" here the word *nature* signifies, not the substance of man, but something that adheres to his nature or substance.

13. As the Latin words *substantia* and *accidens* are not words of the holy Scriptures, and, besides, are not understood by common persons, they should not be employed in sermons before the unintelligent or ignorant, nor be obtruded upon them.

These words, however, are retained with propriety in discussions respecting original sin in the schools among the learned, since they are well understood there, and are employed, without being misunderstood, as terms by which the essence of any object, and its accidental properties are properly distinguished.

For the difference between the work of God and that of the devil can be explained with the utmost perspicuity by means of these words; since the devil can create no substance, but can only, by the permission of God, corrupt in its *accidents* or qualities the substance created by God.

II. OF FREEWILL.

The chief question in this controversy.

Inasmuch as the will of man can be considered in four different states, namely:—1. Before the fall: 2. After the fall: 3. After regeneration; 4. After the resurrection of the body: the chief question here relates to the will and powers of man in the second state only, namely, what power has he of himself in spiritual things, since the fall of our first parents, previous to his regeneration? And, is he able or not able by his own powers, before he is regenerated through the Spirit of God, to fit and prepare himself for the grace of God, and to accept the grace offered through the Holy Spirit in the Word and holy Sacraments?

AFFIRMATIVE.

The pure doctrine, in conformity with God's Word, concerning this article.

1. Our doctrine, faith, and confession concerning this point are the following: That man's understanding and reason are blind in spiritual matters, and that he can understand nothing by his own powers; as it is written, 1 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned."

2. Further, we believe, teach, and confess, that the unregenerate will of man has not only become alienated from God, but also hostile to God, so that his desire and will are directed to that alone which is evil, and to that which is contrary to God; as it is written, Gen. 8, 21: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth;" again, Rom. 8, 7: "The carnal mind is enmity against God; for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." Indeed, as little as a dead body can make itself alive or restore bodily life, so little can man, who is spiritually dead through sin, raise himself to spiritual life; as it is written, Eph. 2, 5: "Even when we were dead in sins," God "hath quickened us together with Christ;" 2 Cor. 3, 5: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing, as of ourselves, but our sufficiency is of God."

3. But God the Holy Spirit produces conversion, not without means, but employs in this work, the preaching and hearing of God's Word; as it is written, Rom. 1, 16: "The Gospel is the power of God unto salvation;" again, Rom. 10, 17: "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God." And it is the will of God, that men should hear his Word, and not stop their ears, Psalm 95, 7, 8. With this Word the Holy Spirit is present and opens the hearts of men, that they, like Lydia in the Acts of the Apostles, chap. 16, 14, may attend to it, and thus become converted, through the grace and power of the Holy Spirit alone, to whom exclusively belongs the work of the conversion of man. For without his grace, our willing and running, Rom. 9, 16, our planting, sowing, and watering, 1 Cor. 3, 7, are all nothing, if, namely, he does not give the increase; as Christ says, John 15, 5: "Without me ye can do nothing." In these few words he denies

the power of freewill, and ascribes all to the grace of God, so that no one might boast before God, 1 Cor. 1, 29; 2 Cor. 12, 5; Jer. 9, 23.

NEGATIVE.

Rejection of contrary and false doctrines.

Accordingly, we reject and condemn all the following errors, as contrary to the standard of the Word of God :

1. The irrational doctrine of the philosophers called Stoics, as also of the Manicheans, who taught that all that happens, so happens from necessity, and cannot otherwise occur; and that man does all through compulsion, even in his external acts, and that he is constrained to do evil works and deeds, such as licentiousness, rapine, murder, theft, and the like.

2. We reject also the gross error of the Pelagians, who taught that man is able by his own powers, without the grace of the Holy Spirit, to convert himself to God, to believe the Gospel, to obey the law of God from his heart, and thus to merit forgiveness of sins and eternal life.

3. We reject also the error of the Semipelagians, who teach that man may by his own powers begin his conversion, but may not complete it without the grace of the Holy Spirit.

4. Likewise, the doctrine, that, although man before his regeneration is too weak in reference to his freewill to make the beginning, and by his own powers to convert himself to God, and to be obedient to the law of God from his heart; yet, when the Holy Spirit by means of the preaching of the Word, has made the beginning, and offered his grace in the Word, then the will of man by its own natural powers, is able, to a limited extent, to help and co-operate in the work of fitting and preparing itself for grace, of apprehending and embracing the same, and of believing the Gospel.

5. Likewise, that man, after he has been regenerated, can keep the law of God perfectly, and fulfil it entirely; and that such fulfilment is our righteousness before God, by which we merit eternal life.

6. Likewise, we reject and condemn also the error of the enthusiasts, who imagine that God draws men to himself, enlightens, justifies, and saves them, without the hearing of the Word of God, and without the use of the holy Sacraments.

7. Likewise, that in conversion and regeneration God entirely extirpates the substance and essence of the old Adam, and especi-

ally the rational soul ; and creates a new essence of the soul out of nothing, in conversion and regeneration.

8. Likewise, when expressions are used without explanation, such as these : that the will of man strives against the Holy Spirit before, during, and after conversion ; and that the Holy Spirit is given to those who resist him designedly and perseveringly ; “for in conversion God makes out of the unwilling, willing men, and dwells in the willing,” as Augustine says.

Expressions of the ancient and modern teachers of the church, like these also occur :—*Deus trahit, sed volentem trahit* ; that is, God draws, but draws the willing ; again : *Hominis voluntas in conversione non est otiosa, sed agit aliquid* ; that is, the will of man is not inactive in conversion, but performs a part. Since such expressions are introduced contrary to the doctrine of the grace of God, for the confirmation of the false opinion respecting the powers of man’s freewill in his conversion, we hold that they do not correspond to the form of sound doctrine ; and accordingly, when conversion to God is mentioned, they ought reasonably to be avoided.

It is rightly taught however, on the contrary, that in conversion, God, through the drawing, that is, the influence, of the Holy Spirit, makes willing men out of the obstinate and unwilling ; and that after such conversion, in the daily exercise of repentance, the regenerated will of man does not remain inactive, but co-operates in all the works of the Holy Spirit, which he performs through us.

9. Also, when Dr. Luther writes, that the will of man in his conversion, remains purely passive, that is, that it does nothing at all, this declaration is to be understood *respectu divinæ gratiæ in accendendis novis motibus* ; that is, when the Spirit of God, through the hearing of the Word, or through the use of the holy Sacraments, reaches the will of man, and effects the new birth or conversion. For when the Holy Spirit has effected and accomplished this work, and through his divine power and operation alone, has changed and renewed the will of man, this new will of man is an instrument and organ of God the Holy Spirit, so that it not only accepts grace, but also co-operates in subsequent works of the Holy Spirit.

Consequently, before the conversion of man, there are but two efficient causes found producing conversion, namely, the Holy Spirit, and the Word of God as the instrument of the Holy Spirit, through which he effects conversion, and which man is to hear ; he cannot, however, have faith in it and accept it through his own

powers, but exclusively through the grace and operation of God the Holy Spirit.

III. OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

The chief question in this controversy.

As our churches unanimously confess, according to the Word of God, and according to the contents of the Augsburg Confession, that we miserable sinners become righteous before God, or, are justified and saved, through faith in Christ only, and as, consequently, Christ alone is our righteousness, who is true God and man, since in him the divine and human natures are personally united, Jer. 23, 6; 1 Cor. 1, 30; 2 Cor. 5, 21, the question has arisen:—According to which nature is Christ our righteousness? And thus two errors which conflict with each other, have disturbed several of our churches.

For, the one party has maintained that Christ is our righteousness according to his divinity alone, when he dwells in us through faith; and that, as compared with his divinity, dwelling in us through faith, the sins of all men are regarded as a drop of water in the great sea. On the contrary, others have maintained that Christ is our righteousness before God according to his human nature alone.

AFFIRMATIVE.

The pure doctrine of the Christian church opposed to both of these errors.

1. In opposition to both the errors now specified, we believe, teach, and confess unanimously, that Christ is our righteousness, neither according to the divine nature alone, nor yet according to the human nature alone, but the *whole Christ* according to both natures, in or through that obedience alone which he, as God and man, rendered to the Father even unto death, and by which he has merited for us forgiveness of sins and eternal life; as it is written, Rom. 5, 19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners, so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous."

2. Accordingly, we believe, teach, and confess, that our righteousness before God is this—that God forgives us our sins out of pure grace, without any regard to our antecedent, present, or subsequent works, merit, or worthiness; granting and imputing to us the righteousness of the obedience of Christ; on account of which

righteousness we are received into favor with God and reputed as just.

3. We believe, teach, and confess, that faith alone is the medium and instrument, by which we apprehend Christ; and thus we also apprehend that righteousness which avails before God, in Christ, for whose sake this faith is imputed to us for righteousness, Rom. 4, 5.

4. We believe, teach, and confess, that this justifying faith is not a mere knowledge of the history concerning Christ, but so great a gift of God, that thereby we rightly acknowledge Christ our Redeemer in the word of the Gospel, and trust in him, namely, that we have forgiveness of sins by grace for the sake of his obedience alone, and are accounted holy and righteous before God the Father, and shall obtain eternal life.

5. We believe, teach, and confess, that according to the phraseology of the holy Scriptures, the word *to justify*, in this article, signifies *to absolve*, that is, *to pronounce a sentence of release from sin*, as illustrated in the following passage: "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord," Prov. 17, 15; again, "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth," Rom. 8, 33.

And whenever, instead of the word *justification*, the words *regeneration* and *renewal of life* are employed, as is done in the Apology of the Augsburg Confession, these words must be understood in the above sense. For, elsewhere these expressions imply the renewal of man, between which and justification by faith, a distinction is made with propriety.

6. We also believe, teach, and confess, that notwithstanding many weaknesses and imperfections still adhere to true believers and the truly regenerated even to their death, yet they should not for that reason doubt, either concerning the righteousness which is imputed to them through faith, or concerning the salvation of their souls; but rather firmly believe that for Christ's sake, according to the promise and word of the holy Gospel, they have a merciful God.

7. We believe, teach, and confess, that for the preservation of the pure doctrine concerning the righteousness of faith before God, the *particulæ exclusivæ*, that is, the following words of the holy apostle Paul, by which the merit of Christ is wholly separated from our works, and the honor attributed to Christ alone, are to be maintained with special diligence, as when the holy apostle Paul writes, "by grace," Eph. 2, 5, 8; "freely," Rom. 3, 24; "without the law," Rom. 3, 21, Gal. 3, 11; "without works," Rom.

4, 6; “without the deeds of the law,” Rom. 3, 28; all of which words signify alike that we are righteous and saved through faith in Christ alone.

8. We believe, teach, and confess, that although an antecedent contrition with subsequent good works, does not pertain to this article of justification before God, yet a justifying faith must not be imagined to consist in any wise with an evil intention to sin and to act contrary to conscience; but, after man is justified through faith, true and living *faith* worketh by love, Gal. 5, 6. Hence good works always follow justifying faith, and are certainly found with it, when it is true and living; as it is never alone, but is always accompanied by love and hope.

ANTITHESIS OR NEGATIVE.

Rejection of opposite and false doctrines.

Accordingly we reject and condemn all the following errors:

1. That Christ is our righteousness according to the divine nature alone.

2. That Christ is our righteousness according to the human nature alone.

3. That in the declarations of the Prophets and Apostles, in which justification by faith is spoken of, the words *to justify* and *to be justified*, should not signify, to declare, or be declared, free from sin, and to obtain forgiveness of sins; but, to be made in reality just before God, in consequence of the love of virtue, and of the works which flow from love, infused by the Holy Spirit.

4. That faith views not the obedience of Christ alone, but his divine nature, so far as the same dwells and works in us, and that through such indwelling our sins are covered.

5. That faith is such a reliance on the obedience of Christ as can exist and remain in a person, who has not truly repented and subsequently exhibited love, but who, against his own conscience, persists in sinning.

6. That not God himself dwells in believers, but only the gifts of God.

7. That faith saves, because the renewal which consists in love towards God and our neighbor, is begun in us by faith.

8. That faith has indeed the pre-eminence in justification; but that nevertheless our renewal and love pertain also to our justification before God, and that while they are not the principal cause

of our righteousness, still our righteousness before God, without this love and renewal, would not be complete or perfect.

9. That believers are justified before God and saved, at the same time, through the imputed righteousness of Christ, and through the new obedience which was begun, or partly through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and partly through the new obedience which was begun.

10. That the promise of grace is appropriated to us through faith in the heart, and also through the confession which is made with the lips, and through other virtues.

11. That faith does not justify without good works; so that good works are required as necessary to righteousness, and that without their presence no man can be justified.

IV. OF GOOD WORKS.

The chief question in the controversy concerning good works.

With respect to the doctrine concerning good works, two different controversies arose in several churches.

1. First, several theologians disagreed among themselves in reference to the following declarations; the one party wrote:—

Good works are necessary to salvation: It is impossible to be saved without good works; again: No one has ever been saved without good works.

The others, on the contrary, maintained—

That good works are pernicious to salvation.

2. Afterwards another disagreement occurred between several theologians concerning the two words, *necessary* and *free*. The one party contended that the word *necessary* ought not to be used concerning the new obedience, which does not flow from necessity and constraint, but from a voluntary mind. The other party maintained the word *necessary*, because this obedience does not depend on our free choice, but the regenerated are in duty bound to render such obedience.

This discussion concerning these words afterwards led to a controversy concerning the matter in itself; the one party contended that the law should not at all be urged among Christians, but the people should be admonished to good works out of the holy Gospel alone. This the other party opposed.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Pure doctrine of the Christian church in relation to these controversies.

For the purpose of affording a complete explanation and decision of this controversy, we set forth the following as our doctrine, faith, and confession :

1. That good works certainly and undoubtedly, like the fruit of a good tree, follow *true* faith, that is to say, not a dead but a living faith.

2. We also believe, teach, and confess, that good works should be entirely excluded when the subject of our salvation is discussed, as also we do with regard to the article of justification before God, in conformity to the clear words and testimony of the Apostle, when he writes thus : “ Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works, saying, Blessed are they whose iniquities are forgiven, and whose sins are covered,” Rom. 4, 6, 7 ; again, “ For by grace are ye saved through faith ; and that not of yourselves ; it is the gift of God : not of works, lest any man should boast,” Eph. 2, 8, 9.

3. We also believe, teach, and confess, that all men, but especially those who are regenerated and renewed through the Holy Spirit, are under obligation to do good works.

4. And in this sense, the words, *necessity*, *shall*, and *must*, are used in a correct and Christian manner, even in regard to the regenerated ; and they are in no way contrary to the form of sound words.

5. Yet by the words, *necessity* and *necessary*, when speaking of the regenerated, we should understand, not a constraint, but the due obedience only which true believers render so far as they are regenerated, not from compulsion of the law, but from a voluntary mind, since they are no more under the law, but under grace, Rom. 6, 14, 15 ; 7, 6 ; 8, 14.

6. Accordingly we also believe, teach, and confess, that when it is said, “ The regenerated perform good works out of a free or voluntary mind,” it should not be understood as if it lay in the will or choice of the regenerated person to do good or to omit it, when he pleases, and that he could still retain his faith, although he should persevere in sin designedly.

7. Yet this is to be understood not otherwise than Christ the Lord and his apostles themselves have declared, namely, concerning the freed spirit, that it performs these services, not through fear

of punishment, like a servant, but through love of righteousness, like a child, Rom. 8, 15.

8. This freedom of the spirit, however, in the elect children of God is not perfect, but it is encumbered with great weakness, as St. Paul, Rom. 7, 14-25; Gal. 5, 17, complains concerning himself.

9. This weakness the Lord does not, however, impute to his elect, for the sake of Christ the Lord; as it is written, Rom. 8, 1: "There is, therefore, now no condemnation to them which are in Christ Jesus."

10. We believe, teach, and confess, moreover, that works do not preserve or secure faith and salvation in us, but the Spirit of God alone, through faith; of whose presence and indwelling, good works are the evidence.

NEGATIVE.

False doctrines opposed to the former.

1. We accordingly reject and condemn expressions or doctrines like these:—that good works are necessary to salvation; again, that no one has ever been saved without good works; again, that it is impossible to be saved without good works.

2. We reject and condemn this naked expression as offensive and pernicious to Christian discipline, namely, when it is said: good works are injurious with respect to salvation.

For especially in these latter times, is it no less necessary to encourage the people to a Christian life and to good works, and to remind them of the importance of exercising themselves in good works, for the manifestation of their faith and their gratitude to God, than it is necessary to guard against intermingling works in the article concerning justification; since men can incur condemnation, as well through an Epicurean conception concerning faith, as through a Papistical and Pharisaical trust in their own works and merits.

3. We also reject and condemn the doctrine, that faith and the indwelling of the Holy Spirit are not lost through wilful sin, but that the saints and elect retain the Holy Spirit, even if they are led to commit adultery and other sins, and persevere in them.

V. OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

The chief question in this controversy.

Whether the preaching of the holy Gospel be properly, not only a preaching of grace, that announces the forgiveness of sins to us,

but also a preaching of repentance, reproving the sin of unbelief, which is not reprov'd in the law, but through the Gospel alone.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Pure doctrine of the Word of God.

1. We believe, teach, and confess, that the distinction between the Law and the Gospel, as a peculiarly glorious light, is to be maintained in the church with the greatest fidelity, so that the Word of God may be rightly divided, according to the admonition of St. Paul, 2 Tim. 2, 15.

2. We believe, teach, and confess, that the *Law* is properly a divinely revealed doctrine, teaching that which is right and pleasing to God, and rebuking all that is sinful and contrary to the will of God.

3. Therefore all portions of Scripture which reprove sin, really belong to the preaching of the law.

4. But *the Gospel* is properly a system of *doctrine*, teaching that which man, who has not kept the law and is condemned by it, should believe; namely, that Christ has atoned and made satisfaction for all sins, and obtained and procured for him, without any merit on his part, remission of sins, righteousness which abides before God, and eternal life.

5. Inasmuch, however, as the word *Gospel* is not always used in one and the same sense in the holy Scriptures, from which circumstance indeed, this controversy originally sprang,—we believe, teach, and confess that, when by the word *Gospel*, the whole doctrine of Christ which he proclaimed during his ministry, and his apostles after him, is understood, (in which sense it is used in Mark 1, 14, 15; Acts 20, 24,) it then may be rightly said and written that the Gospel is the preaching of repentance and remission of sins.

6. But when the Law and the Gospel, as also Moses as a teacher of the Law, and Christ as a preacher of the Gospel, are compared, we believe, teach, and confess, that the Gospel is not a preaching of repentance, reproving sin, but properly speaking nothing less than a declaration and preaching of consolation and of joyful news, neither reproving nor terrifying, but consoling the conscience against the terrors of the law, pointing to the merits of Christ alone, and by its cheering declarations respecting the grace and favor of God, obtained through the merits of Christ, restoring peace to it.

7. With respect to the revelation of sins, the veil of Moses covers the eyes of all persons, as long as they hear the mere preaching of

the law, and hear nothing concerning Christ. Thus they do not learn from the law to perceive their sins rightly, but either become presumptuous hypocrites like the Pharisees, or they despair like Judas; hence Christ, Matt. 5, 21, sqq.; Rom. 7, 14, takes the law in his hands, and explains it spiritually, and thus through the law the wrath of God in its whole extent, is revealed from heaven against all sinners, Rom. 1, 18, and then first they learn from it to perceive their sins rightly; this knowledge Moses never could have conveyed to them.

While, therefore, on the one hand, the preaching of the sufferings and death of Christ, the Son of God, is full of severity and terror, and points out the wrath of God, by which people are first rightly led into the law, after the veil of Moses is removed, and clearly perceive what great things God requires of them in the law, none of which they are able to observe, which renders it necessary for them to seek all their righteousness in Christ alone:

8. Yet, on the other hand, as long as the suffering and death of Christ, place the wrath of God before our eyes and terrify mankind, so long is this not a declaration of the Gospel, but an exhibition of the law and of Moses; it is consequently a work foreign from Christ's, by which he advances to his peculiar office, which is to preach the grace of God, to console, and to make alive; this is properly the preaching of the Gospel.

NEGATIVE.

The contrary doctrine, which is rejected.

Accordingly we reject and hold as false and pernicious, the doctrine, that the Gospel is properly a preaching of repentance, or a reproving, accusing, and condemning of sins, and not solely a preaching of grace; for by such a doctrine, the Gospel is again transformed into a teaching of the law, the merits of Christ, and the holy Scripture are obscured, Christians are deprived of true consolation, and the door is opened again to Papistical errors and superstitions.

VI. OF THE THIRD USE OF THE LAW.

The chief question in this controversy.

Inasmuch as the law was given to man for three purposes:— First, that through it external discipline might be preserved and the unruly and disobedient might be restrained; secondly, that

through it men might be led to a knowledge of their sins ; thirdly, that after their regeneration and the experience that the flesh still clings to them, they might have a certain rule, according to which they should direct and regulate their whole lives : a controversy has arisen between some few theologians concerning the third use of the law ; namely, Whether it is to be inculcated, and its observance to be urged among regenerated Christians too, or not. The one party maintained the affirmative, the other denied the last proposition.

AFFIRMATIVE.

The true Christian doctrine concerning this controversy.

1. We believe, teach, and confess, that, although those who sincerely believe in Christ and are truly converted to God, are liberated through Christ, and acquitted from the curse and constraint of the law, yet they are not, for this reason, without law, but they are redeemed by the Son of God, in order that they should exercise themselves in it day and night, Psalm 1, 2 ; 119, 1, sqq. For our first parents did not live without law, even before the fall ; in their hearts the law of God was written, when they were created in the image of God, Gen. 2, 16 sqq. ; 3, 3.

2. We believe, teach, and confess, that the preaching of the law is to be urged with diligence, not only among those who have no faith in Christ, and who are impenitent, but also among those who truly believe in Christ, who are truly converted to God, who are regenerated, and who are justified through faith.

3. For even if they are regenerated, and renewed in the spirit of their mind, yet this regeneration and this renovation are not perfect in this world, but are only commenced. And believers are, in the spirit of their mind, engaged in a continual struggle against the flesh, that is, this corrupt nature, which adheres to us till death, Gal. 5, 17 ; Rom. 7, 23. And on account of the old Adam, who still dwells in the understanding, the will, and all the powers of man, it is necessary that the law of God should be presented as a light to them, in order that they may not, in their own religious exercises, devise any mode of worship which the law of God does not appoint ; and also in order that the old Adam may not use his own will, but be constrained, not only by the admonitions and menaces of the law, but also by chastisements and plagues, against his will, to follow and yield himself captive to the Spirit. (1 Cor. 9, 27 ; Rom. 6, 12 ; Gal. 6, 14 ; Psalm 119, 1, sqq. ; Heb. 12, 1.)

4. Touching the difference between the works of the law, and the fruits of the Spirit, we believe, teach, and confess, that the works which are done according to the law, are called, and really are, works of the law, as long as they are extorted from man by the dread of punishment and by the threatening of the wrath of God.

5. But the fruits of the Spirit are those works which the Spirit of God, dwelling in believers, performs through the regenerated, and which are done by the believers, so far as they are regenerated, voluntarily and freely as if they had received no command, heard no threat, and expected no reward. In this manner then the children of God live in the law, and conduct themselves according to the law of God; which manner of living St. Paul in his Epistles, calls the law of Christ, and the law of the mind, Rom. 7, 25; 8, 2, 7; Gal. 6, 2.

6. Thus the law remains, both with the penitent and the impenitent, with regenerated and unregenerated men, one only law, namely, the immutable will of God. And the difference, so far as it pertains to obedience, is in the persons alone, of whom he who is not yet regenerated, renders to the law, through constraint and with unwillingness, that which is required of him, (as also the regenerated do according to the flesh,) but the believer, without constraint, but with a free and willing spirit, so far as he is regenerated, renders such obedience as no threat of the law could ever extort from him.

NEGATIVE.

False doctrine rejected.

Accordingly we reject as pernicious and false, and as adverse to Christian discipline and true piety, the doctrine, which asserts that the law should not be enforced in the way and manner mentioned above, among Christians and true believers, but only among unbelievers, infidels, and the impenitent.

VII. OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Although the Zwinglian teachers are not to be reckoned among the number of theologians receiving the Augsburg Confession, from whom they withdrew at the time when this Confession was delivered; yet since they now attempt to obtrude themselves upon the latter, and to circulate their error under the cover of this Christian Confession, we shall give the necessary information also concerning this dissension.

The chief controversy between our doctrine and that of the sacramentarians, with respect to this article.

Whether the true body and blood of our Lord Jesus Christ, are or are not truly and essentially, or substantially, present in the Lord's Supper, administered with the bread and wine, and received with the lips, by all those who use this sacrament, be they worthy or unworthy, good or evil, believing or unbelieving; being received by the believing unto consolation and life, but by the unbelieving unto judgment. The sacramentarians maintain the negative, we the affirmative.

For the purpose of explaining this controversy, it is in the first place to be observed, that there are two different classes of sacramentarians. Some are gross sacramentarians, who, as indeed they believe in their hearts, allege in clear and explicit words, that in the Lord's Supper, nothing more than bread and wine are present, administered, and received with the lips. But others are artful and the most pernicious of all sacramentarians; these in part use our words most speciously, and pretend that they also believe a real presence of the true, essential, or substantial, body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper; yet they maintain, that this comes to pass spiritually, through faith. Now, under these specious words they conceal the gross opinion of the former class, namely, that in the Lord's Supper, there is nothing present, and received with the lips, beside the bread and wine. For with them the word *spiritually* signifies nothing else than the Spirit of Christ, or the virtue of the absent body of Christ, and his merit, which latter is present; but they assert that the body of Christ is in no way or manner present, but only remains in the highest heaven above, to whom in heaven we must elevate ourselves in the thoughts of our faith, and there, but by no means in connection with the bread and wine of the Lord's Supper, we must seek his body and blood.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Confession of the pure doctrine concerning the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in opposition to the sacramentarians.

1. We believe, teach, and confess, that in the Lord's Supper, the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially, or substantially, present, and with the bread and wine are truly administered and received.

2. We believe, teach, and confess, that the words of the testament of Christ, are not to be understood otherwise than according to their literal sense, so that the bread does not signify the absent body of Christ, and the wine, the absent blood of Christ, but on account of their sacramental union, the bread and wine are truly the body and blood of Christ.

3. With respect to the consecration, we believe, teach, and confess, that the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is not effected by the work of any man, or by the declaration of the minister, but that it is to be ascribed wholly to the omnipotent power of our Lord Jesus Christ alone.

4. But we, moreover, believe, teach, and hold unanimously, that in the use of this holy sacrament, the words of the institution of Christ, are in no wise to be omitted, but are to be publicly recited, as the Apostle writes: "The cup of blessing, which we bless," &c., 1 Cor. 10, 16. And this blessing takes place through the recitation of the words of Christ. *the words of the institution* *P-67*

5. But the grounds on which we maintain our position in this controversy with the sacramentarians, are such as Dr. Luther has laid down in his Larger Confession concerning the sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

The first is this article of our Christian faith:—Jesus Christ is true, essential, natural, perfect God and man, in one person, inseparable and undivided.

The second:—That the right hand of God is everywhere, and that at this right hand, Christ, according to his human nature, is seated, in deed and in truth, and consequently reigns, not as being absent but present, and has in his hands and under his feet, all that is in heaven and on earth; at that right hand, according to the Scriptures, Eph. 1, 22, no man nor angel but the Son of Mary alone, is seated; hence he is also able to perform that which has been asserted.

The third:—That the Word of God is neither deceitful nor untrue.

The fourth:—That God knows and has within his power various modes, in which he can at any time be present in a place, and is not confined to that one which philosophers call local or circumscribed.

6. We believe, teach, and confess, that the body and blood of Christ are received with bread and wine, not only spiritually through faith, but also orally or with the lips; yet not in a Capernaitic, but in a supernatural and heavenly manner, on account of the sacramental union. This is clearly shown by the words of Christ, when he says: "Take, eat, and drink," which was done by the Apostles; for

it is written : “ And they all drank of it,” Mark 14, 23. And likewise St. Paul says : “ The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ ?” 1 Cor. 10, 16. That is, whoever eats this bread, eats the body of Christ. This the most eminent ancient teachers of the church, Chrysostom, Cyprian, Leo I., Gregory, Ambrose, and Augustine, also unanimously testify.

7. We believe, teach, and confess, that not only the truly believing and the worthy, but also the unworthy and the unbelieving, receive the true body and blood of Christ. Yet the latter receive them, not unto life and comfort, but unto judgment and condemnation, if they are not converted, and do not repent, 1 Cor. 11, 27, 29.

For, although they reject Christ as a Savior, they must still, even against their will, admit him as a strict judge, who as being present, exercises and manifests judgment in the case of impenitent guests, even as he by his presence works life and consolation in the hearts of the truly believing and worthy guests.

8. We also believe, teach, and confess, that there is but one species of unworthy guests : namely, those who do not believe. Concerning these it is written, John 3, 18 : “ He that believeth not is condemned already.” This condemnation is rendered greater and more heavy through an unworthy use of this holy sacrament, 1 Cor. 11, 29.

9. We believe, teach, and confess, that no true believer, as long as he retains a living faith, however weak it may be, receives unto judgment this holy sacrament, which was instituted especially on account of Christians who are weak in faith, yet penitent, for the consolation and confirmation of their weak faith.

10. We believe, teach, and confess, that all the worthiness of the guests at this heavenly feast, consists in the most holy obedience and perfect merit of Christ alone,—which we apply to ourselves through true faith ; and of this application we receive the assurance through this sacrament,—and by no means depends on our virtues or interior and exterior preparations.

NEGATIVE.

Contrary doctrine of the sacramentarians condemned.

On the other hand, we unanimously reject and condemn all the following erroneous articles, which are repugnant to the doctrine, the simple faith, and the sincere confession concerning the Supper of Christ, which we have now recited :

1. The Papistical *transubstantiation*, that is when it is taught by

the Papists, that bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, lose their substance and natural essence or character, and thus are annihilated; and that these elements are in such a manner transmuted into the body of Christ, that the external form alone remains.

2. The Papistical sacrifice of the mass, offered up for the sins of the living and the dead.

3. The sacrilegious institution, according to which only one part of the Sacrament is given to the laity, and contrary to the express words of the testament of Christ, the cup is withheld from them, so that they are robbed of the blood of Christ.

4. The doctrine, that the words of the testament of Christ are not to be understood or believed simply as they read, but that they are obscure expressions, and that therefore their true sense must first be sought in other portions of Scripture.

5. That in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the body of Christ is not received orally with the bread, but that bread and wine alone are received with the lips; and that the body of Christ is received only spiritually, through faith.

6. That bread and wine in this holy sacrament, are nothing more than signs, by which Christians recognize each other.

7. That bread and wine are only figures, images, and types of the far-distant body and blood of Christ.

8. That bread and wine are nothing more than memorials, seals, and pledges, by which we are assured that when faith soars upwards into heaven, it there becomes a participant of the body and blood of Christ, as truly as we eat and drink bread and wine in the Lord's Supper.

9. That the assurance and confirmation of our faith in the Lord's Supper, are effected through the external signs of bread and wine alone, and not through the true, present body and blood of Christ.

10. That in the holy Supper, only the virtue, operation, and merit of the absent body and blood of Christ, are dispensed.

11. That the body of Christ is inclosed in heaven, in such a mode that he can in no manner be present at the same time, in many, or all places on earth where his holy Supper is celebrated.

12. That Christ could neither promise nor exhibit the essential, or substantial, presence of his body and blood in the holy Supper, since the nature and the properties of his assumed human nature, can neither bear nor admit of it.

13 That God with all his omnipotence is not able (which is a fearful saying) to provide that the body of Christ shall be essentially, or substantially, present at one time, in more than one place.

14. That the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper, is caused or effected, not by the almighty word of the testament of Christ, but by faith.

15. That believers should not seek the body of Christ in the bread and wine of the holy Supper, but that they should raise their eyes from the bread to heaven, and there seek the body of Christ.

16. That unbelieving, impenitent Christians receive, not the true body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper, but bread and wine alone.

17. That the worthiness of the guests at this heavenly feast, depends not exclusively upon true faith in Christ, but also upon external human preparation.

18. That true believers also, who have and retain a genuine, pure, and living faith in Christ, can receive this sacrament unto judgment, on account of the imperfections which remain in their external deportment.

19. That bread and wine, the external visible elements, in the holy Sacrament, should be adored.

20. Likewise we commit to the just judgment of God, all the bold, derisive, and blasphemous questions (which decency forbids us to recite) and all expressions, which are most blasphemously and offensively employed after a gross, carnal, Capernaitic and abominable manner, by the sacramentarians, concerning the supernatural, and heavenly mysteries of this sacrament.

21. We therefore, hereby entirely deny the Capernaitic [or gross, physical, John 6, 24, 51, sqq.] eating of the body of Christ, which the sacramentarians, against the testimony of their own conscience, and after all our manifold protestations, maliciously assign to us, for the purpose of bringing odium on our doctrine among their hearers, as if we taught that his flesh is torn in pieces with the teeth, and digested like other food. On the contrary, we hold and believe, according to the express words of the testament of Christ, a true, yet supernatural eating of the body of Christ, as also such a drinking of his blood. But, this eating and drinking, the senses or reason of man cannot comprehend; but our understanding, in this matter, as in all other articles of faith, is brought into captivity to the obedience of Christ, 2 Cor. 10, 5. For this mystery is revealed in the Word of God alone, and is comprehended by faith alone.

VIII. OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

Out of the controversy concerning the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, a dissension has arisen between the avowed theologians of

the Augsburg Confession, and the Calvinists, (who have disturbed some other theologians also,) concerning the person of Christ, the two natures in Christ, and their properties.

The chief question in this controversy.

The principal subject of debate, was:—Whether the divine and human natures, as also the properties of each, on account of the personal union, have communion with each other *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, in the person of Christ, and how far this communion extends.

The sacramentarians affirmed, that the divine and human natures in Christ are personally united in such a manner that neither communicates anything to the other *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, which is peculiar to itself, but that their mere names are mutually communicated. For, as they assert, *unio facit communia nomina*, that is, the personal union makes nothing more than the names common, to wit, that God is called man, and man God; yet in such a manner, that *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, God has nothing common with the humanity, and the humanity nothing with the divinity, as far as its majesty and its properties are concerned. But the contrary opinion was maintained against the sacramentarians, by Dr. Luther and those who coincided with him.

AFFIRMATIVE.

Pure doctrine of the Christian church, concerning the person of Christ.

For the purpose of explaining this controversy and deciding it according to the analogy of our Christian faith, we declare that our doctrine, faith, and confession, are the following:

1. That the divine and human natures in Christ are personally united, so that there are not two Christs, one the Son of God, the other the Son of man; but the one and the same Christ is the Son of God and the Son of man, Luke 1, 35; Rom. 9, 5.

2. We believe, teach, and confess, that the divine and human natures are not commingled into one essence, or substance, and that the one is not changed into the other; but that each nature retains its essential properties, which never can become the properties of the other.

3. The attributes of the divine nature are these: to be omnipotent, eternal, infinite, and according to the property of that nature

and its essential character: to be of itself omnipresent, to know all things, &c. All these never become the attributes of the human nature.

4. The attributes of the human nature are these: to be a corporeal creature, to consist of flesh and blood, to be finite and circumscribed, to suffer, to die, to ascend, to descend, to move from place to place, to hunger, to thirst, to experience cold, heat, or similar things. These never become the attributes of the divine nature.

5. But since the divine and human natures are united personally, that is, in one person, we believe, teach, and confess, that this personal or hypostatic union is not such a connection or combination that neither nature can personally, that is, by reason of personal union, possess any property in common with the other, as it occurs in the combination which takes place when two pieces of wood are glued together, a case in which neither piece imparts any property to the other, nor receives any from it. But here there is in the highest degree a communion which God really maintains with the man; and from this personal union and the exalted and ineffable communion which thence results, proceeds all that is said and believed concerning God as man, and concerning the man Christ as God. This union and communion of natures, the ancient teachers of the church explain by the similitude of red-hot iron, and also by the union of body and soul in man.

6. Hence we believe, teach, and confess, that God is man, and man God; which could not be, if the divine and the human natures had no communion at all with each other.

For how could the man, the Son of Mary, truly be, or with truth be called God, or the Son of God the most High, if his humanity were not personally united with the Son of God, and thus *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, had nothing in common with the latter, except the mere name of God?

7. Hence we believe, teach, and confess, that the Virgin Mary did not conceive and bring forth simply a mere man, but the true Son of God; for which reason she is also rightly called, and she is truly the mother of God.

8. Wherefore we also believe, teach, and confess, that it was not a mere man only who suffered for us, died, was buried, who descended into hell, rose from the dead, ascended into heaven, and was raised to the majesty and almighty power of God; but a man whose human nature has a union and a communication with the Son of God so inexpressibly intimate as to become one person with him.

9. Wherefore the Son of God truly suffered for us, but neverthe-

less according to the property of his human nature, which he assumed in the unity of his divine nature and made his own, so that he might be able to suffer and to become, as our high-priest, the cause of our reconciliation with God, as it is written: "They crucified the Lord of glory," and "the church of God which he hath purchased with his own blood," 1 Cor. 2, 8; Acts 20, 28. 2172

10. Hence we believe, teach, and confess, that the Son of man is exalted *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, according to the human nature, to the right hand of the omnipotent majesty and power of God, because the man was taken up in God, when he was conceived in his mother's womb by the Holy Ghost, and his human nature was personally united with the Son of the Most High.

11. This majesty Christ always possessed according to the personal union; and yet he divested himself of it in the state of his humiliation, Phil. 2, 7; and for this reason he truly increased in all wisdom and favor with God and man, (Luke 2, 52;) hence he did not always manifest this majesty, but only when it seemed good to him to do so, until he wholly and entirely laid aside the form of a servant,—but not however his human nature,—after his resurrection, and was established in the full use, revelation, and manifestation of the divine majesty, and thus entered into his glory. He consequently now, not only as God, but also as man, knows all things, is able to do all things, is present to all creatures, and has under his feet and in his hands, (John 13, 3,) all that is in heaven and on earth, and under the earth, as he himself testifies: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Matt. 28, 18. And St. Paul, Eph. 4, 10, says: "He ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things;" this power which he possesses, he can exercise every where, being omnipresent, and all things are possible and known to him.

12. Hence he is also able, and it is altogether easy for him, in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, to impart his true body and blood, being present; and this is done, not according to the mode or property of the human nature, but according to the mode and property of the right hand of God, as Dr. Luther says in our Christian Catechism; which presence of Christ in his holy Supper, is not earthly nor Capernaïtic, but nevertheless most true and essential, or substantial, as the words of his testament declare, Matt. 26, 26: *This is*—this IS my body, &c.

By this doctrine, faith, and confession of ours, the person of Christ is not divided, as it was by the doctrine of Nestorius, who denied the *communicatio idiomatum*, that is, the true communication of the

properties of both natures in Christ, and thus divided the person, as referred to by Luther in his book concerning the Councils; nor are the natures together with their properties, mingled with each other in one essence, which was the erroneous doctrine of Eutyches; nor is the human nature in the person of Christ denied or abolished; nor is the one nature changed into the other; but Christ is, and remains to all eternity, God and man in one undivided person. And this, next to the holy Trinity, is the highest *mystery*, as the Apostle testifies, 1 Tim. 3, 16; on which our whole consolation, life, and salvation depend.

NEGATIVE.

Contrary and false doctrines concerning the person of Christ.

Accordingly we reject and condemn, as repugnant to the Word of God and to our pure Christian faith, all the following erroneous articles:

1. That God and man in Christ are not one person, but that one is the Son of God, and another is the Son of man, as Nestorius irrationally maintained.

2. That the divine and the human natures are commingled in one essence, and that the human nature is changed into the Deity, as Eutyches asserted.

3. That Christ is not true, natural, eternal God, as Arius maintained.

4. That Christ does not possess a true human nature consisting of body and soul, as Marcion vainly imagined.

5. That the personal union effects a communion of titles and names only.

6. That, to say that God is man, or that man is God, is a mere phrase or mode of speaking; for that the divinity has *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, nothing in common with the humanity, and the humanity nothing in common with the divinity.

7. That, to say, "the Son of God died for the sins of the world," or, "the Son of man is become Almighty," implies merely a communication in words, without an actual communication of properties.

8. That the human nature in Christ has become an infinite essence, or being, like the divine, and that, owing to this effusion upon or in the human nature, of this essential and communicated power or property, and its separation from God, the human nature at length is, like the divine nature, present everywhere.

9. That the human nature was made equal to the divine nature in respect to its substance, or essence, or its essential and divine properties.

10. That the human nature of Christ is *locally* expanded in or over all places in heaven and on earth,—which property is not to be attributed even to the divine nature.

11. That it is impossible for Christ, on account of the properties of the human nature, to be present at the same time in more than one place with his body, much less everywhere.

12. That his mere humanity alone suffered for us, and redeemed us, and that the Son of God in reality had no communion with it in suffering,—as if all this in no respect concerned him.

13. That Christ is present with us on earth, in the word, in the sacraments, and in all our sorrows, according to his divinity alone, and that this presence does not at all concern his human nature ;—according to which assertion, since he has redeemed us through his sufferings and death, he has nothing more to do with us upon earth, in respect to his humanity.

14. That the Son of God, who assumed human nature, does not, since he has laid aside the form of a servant, perform all the works of his omnipotence, in, through, and with his human nature, but a few only, and in such place alone where the human nature is locally present.

15. That, according to the human nature, he is by no means capable of receiving omnipotence and other properties of the divine nature,—which is against the express declaration of Christ, Matt. 28, 18: “All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.” And St. Paul, Col. 2, 9, says: “In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.”

16. That there is given to him the greatest power in heaven and on earth, in this sense, that it is greater and more than that which is given to all angels and other creatures ; but that he has no communion with the omnipotence of God, and that this is not given to him. Hence they who make this assertion, devise a *media potentia*, that is, a power between the almighty power of God and the power of creatures, which is given to Christ according to his humanity through his exaltation, and which is less than the almighty power of God, but greater than the power of all other creatures.

17. That Christ according to his human spirit has a certain limit, namely, how much he shall know ; and that he knows no more than is due to him, and necessary that he should know for the execution of his office as judge.

18. That Christ has not yet a perfect knowledge of God and of all his works;—although it is written concerning Christ: “In whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge,” Col. 2, 3.

19. That, according to his human spirit, it is impossible for Christ to know that which was from eternity, that which now takes place everywhere, and that which is yet to occur in all eternity.

20. We also reject and condemn the explanation and blasphemous perversion of this passage, Matt. 28, 18: “All power is given unto me,” &c.,—agreeably to which all power in heaven and on earth was restored to Christ according to his divine nature, at his resurrection and ascension to heaven; as if according to his divinity also he had laid aside and abandoned it in the state of his humiliation. For, by this doctrine, not only are the words of the testament of Christ perverted, but the door is also opened to the heresy of the Arians, which long ago has been condemned; so that ultimately the eternal divinity of Christ will be denied, and thus Christ, together with our salvation, will be wholly and entirely lost to us, if this false doctrine is not contradicted by us, supported as we are by the solid and perpetual foundation of God’s Word and our universal Christian faith.

IX. OF CHRIST’S DESCENT INTO HELL.

Chief controversy concerning this article.

In reference to this article, a dispute arose among several theologians professing an adherence to the Augsburg Confession, and it was asked, when, and in what mode, agreeably to our universal Christian faith, Christ the Lord descended to hell, and whether it occurred before or after his death; further, whether it took place according to the soul alone, or according to the divinity alone, or with body and soul, spiritually or corporeally. It was also disputed, whether this article should be referred to the passion, or to the glorious victory and triumph of Christ.

But since the present, like the foregoing article, cannot be comprehended by the senses or by our reason, but must be received by faith alone, our unanimous opinion is, that there should be no disputation concerning this matter, but that it should be believed and taught in the most simple manner. And in reference to it, let us follow the pious doctrine of Dr. Luther, who explained this article in a manner altogether Christian, in a sermon at Torgau, A. D. 1533, &c., rejecting all useless and unnecessary questions, and ad-

monishing all pious Chirtians to seek after a Christian simplicity of faith.

For it ought to be sufficient for us to know, that Christ descended into hell, and abolished it for all believers, by delivering them from the power of death and the devil, from eternal damnation, and from the jaws of hell ; but the mode in which this was effected we should not scrutinize, but reserve the knowledge of it for the world to come, where not only this point, but also others besides, which we here simply believed, but could not comprehend with our blind reason, will be revealed to us.

X. OF CHURCH USAGES OR CEREMONIES,

COMMONLY CALLED ADIAPHORA, OR THINGS INDIFFERENT.

A controversy also arose among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, concerning ceremonies or church usages that are neither commanded nor prohibited in the Word of God, but are introduced into the church for the sake of good order and decorum.

The chief controversy concerning this article.

The main question was, whether in a time of persecution, and in the case of confession, even if the enemies of the Gospel will not agree with us in doctrine, we might with a clear conscience, upon the requirement and demand of our adversaries, re-establish certain abrogated ceremonies, which are in themselves things indifferent, and neither commanded nor prohibited of God, and thus conform to the Papists in such ceremonies and indifferent things, *Adiaphora*. The one party affirmed it, but the other denied it.

AFFIRMATIVE.

The pure and true doctrine and confession concerning this article.

1. For the purpose of deciding this controversy also, we state that we believe, teach, and confess unanimously, that the ceremonies or church usages which are neither commanded nor prohibited in the Word of God, but are instituted for the sake of decorum and good order alone, are in and of themselves no divine service, or worship, nor any part of it ; for it is written, Matt. 15, 9: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men."

2. We believe, teach, and confess, that the church of God, in all places and at all times, has power to alter such ceremonies according to circumstances, as it may be most useful and edifying to the church of God.

3. That, however, in this matter, all levity and the giving of offence should be avoided, and that especial regard should be paid, with all diligence, to the weak in faith, 1 Cor. 8, 9; Rom. 14, 3.

4. We believe, teach, and confess, that in times of persecution, if a clear and firm confession of faith is required from us, we are not to yield to the enemies of the Gospel in these indifferent things; for the Apostle writes: "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage," Gal. 5, 1. Again, "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers: for what communion hath light with darkness?" 2 Cor. 6, 14. Again, "To whom we gave place by subjection, no, not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you," Gal. 2, 5. For in such case, the question no longer concerns indifferent things, but rather the maintenance of the truth of the Gospel and of Christian liberty, lest a manifest idolatry be confirmed and the weak in faith be offended. In these things we can concede nothing to the adversaries; our duty requires us to pronounce our confession in purity and candor, and patiently bear in consequence of it, whatever God sends upon us, and whatever he may allow the enemies of his Word to inflict on us.

5. We also believe, teach, and confess, that no church should condemn another because one observes more or less of those outward ceremonies which God has not commanded, than the other, if they agree in other respects, that is, in the doctrine and in all its articles, as also in a right use of the holy sacraments, according to the well-known saying: *Dissonantia jejunii, non dissolvit consonantiam fidei*; a difference in fasts does not destroy the agreement in matters of faith.

NEGATIVE.

False doctrine concerning this article.

Accordingly we reject and condemn as false and contrary to the Word of God, the following doctrines:

1. That the commandments and ordinances of men in ecclesiastical affairs, considered in themselves, should be held as a service or worship of God, or as a part of divine service, in the churches.

2. When such ceremonies, commandments, and ordinances are by force obtruded upon the church of God as necessary, in opposition to the Christian liberty which the church has in external things.

3. Also, the assertion, that in times of persecution when a public confession is required, we might conform to the will of the enemies of the Gospel, in these indifferent things and ceremonies, or agree with them,—a course which would be highly detrimental to the cause of truth.

4. And also when such external ceremonies and indifferent things are abolished on the supposition that the church of God is not at liberty, according to circumstances, to observe one or more of these ceremonies, when deemed to be useful or edifying.

XI. OF GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE AND ELECTION.

No public controversy has arisen among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, concerning this article. But since it is a consolatory article, when rightly handled, and also in order that no offensive disputation may arise in the progress of time, it is also explained in this writing.

AFFIRMATIVE.

The pure and true doctrine concerning this article.

1. In the first place, the difference between *prescientia* and *predestinatio*, or the foreknowledge and the eternal election of God, ought to be accurately observed.

2. For the foreknowledge of God is nothing else than that God knows all things before they come to pass, as it is written: "But there is a God in heaven that revealeth secrets, and maketh known to the king Nebuchadnezzar what shall be in the latter," Daniel, 2, 28.

3. This foreknowledge pertains alike to the good and to the evil, but is not the cause of evil or of sin, by impelling men to commit wicked acts. For sin derives its origin from the devil and from the wicked and perverted will of man. Nor is this foreknowledge the cause of the destruction of men, which must be imputed to themselves: but it only controls the evil, and assigns bounds to its progress and continuance, so that although an evil in itself, it may nevertheless conduce to the salvation of God's elect.

4. But predestination, or the eternal election of God, pertains to the good and beloved children of God alone; and it is a cause of their salvation, which is his work, and for which he provides all that is appropriate to it. Upon this predestination their salvation is

so firmly founded, that the gates of hell cannot prevail against it, John 10, 28; Matt. 16, 18.

5. This predestination of God is not to be sought out in God's secret counsel, but in the Word of God, in which it is revealed.

6. But the Word of God leads us to Christ, who is the book of life, in which are written and elected all those who shall be eternally saved, as it is written: "According as he hath chosen us in him (Christ) before the foundation of the world," Eph. 1, 4.

7. Christ calls to himself all sinners, and promises a rest to them; and it is his earnest desire that all men should come to him, and permit themselves to be helped. To these he offers himself in the Word as a Redeemer, and wishes them to hear it, and not close their ears, or despise the Word. To this end he promises the aid, power, and operation of the Holy Spirit, and divine aid that we may abide in faith and obtain eternal salvation.

8. We should, therefore, not judge concerning our election to eternal life, either from our reason, or from the law of God, lest we should be led into a dissolute and Epicurean life, or fall into despair. For pernicious thoughts, which it is difficult to resist, are awakened in the hearts of those who follow the mere dictates of their own reason in this matter:—"If God has elected me to salvation, (they say) I cannot be condemned, although I do what I please." And on the other hand: "If I am not elected to eternal life, no good thing that I may do, can avail; all my efforts are made in vain."

9. But the true view concerning predestination, must be derived from the holy Gospel of Christ alone, in which it is clearly testified that "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all;" and "he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," and believe in Christ the Lord. Ezek. 33, 11, and 18, 23; Rom. 11, 32; 2 Pet. 3, 9; 1 John 2, 2.

10. Now this doctrine is salutary and consolatory to those who regard the revealed will of God, and pursue the order which St. Paul in his Epistle to the Romans observes; for he first leads men to repentance, to a knowledge of sin, to faith in Christ, to obedience to God's commands, before he speaks concerning the mystery of the eternal election of God.

11. Now, the text, Matt. 22, 14: "Many are called, but few are chosen"—does not imply that God does not desire to save all men, but the cause [of the damnation of the wicked] is that they either do not hear the Word of God at all, but obstinately condemn it, closing their ears and hardening their hearts, and thus obstruct the

ordinary means of access of the Holy Spirit, so that he cannot perform his work in them; or, if they have heard it, they again neglect and disregard it; of which neither God nor his election, but their own wickedness is the cause, 2 Pet. 2, 1, sqq.; Luke 11, 49, 52; Heb. 12, 25, sqq.

12. A Christian should embrace this article concerning the eternal election of God, so far only as it is revealed in the Word of God. For the Word of God presents unto us Christ as the book of life, which he opens and reveals to us through the preaching of the Gospel, as it is written: "Whom he did predestinate, them he also called," Rom. 8, 30. Therefore, in Christ we should seek the eternal election of the Father, who decreed in his eternal, divine counsel, that besides those who acknowledge Christ to be his Son and truly believe in him, he will save no one. We must banish from our minds other thoughts which flow not from God, but from the insinuations of the evil Spirit, through which he attempts to diminish, or even to take away entirely from us, the sweet consolation which we can derive from this salutary doctrine, by which we are assured that we are elected to eternal life in Christ, through pure grace, without any of our merit, and that no one is able to pluck us out of his hands. And he has not only in simple words promised this gracious election, but he has confirmed it with an oath, and sealed it with the holy sacraments, which we can remember, and by which we can be consoled, in our greatest trials, and quench the fiery darts of the devil.

13. In the mean while we should use our utmost endeavors to live according to the will of God, and to make our calling sure, as St. Peter admonishes us, 2 Pet. 1, 10, and especially adhere to the revealed Word of God, which cannot and will not disappoint us.

14. By this brief explanation of the eternal election of God, the honor is fully and entirely attributed to God, that he saves us through mercy alone, according to the purpose of his will, without any merit of our own; and besides, no cause is given to any one for faintheartedness, or for a dissolute life.

NEGATIVE.

False doctrine concerning this article.

We therefore believe and hold, that when the doctrine concerning the gracious election of God to eternal life, is so set forth that

depressed Christians cannot derive consolation from it, but are rather brought into a state of dejection or despair, or that the impenitent are confirmed in their licentiousness, this doctrine is inculcated, not according to the Word and will of God, but according to human reason and the instigation of Satan; since all that is written, as the Apostle, Rom. 15, 4, testifies, is “written for our learning, that we through patience and comfort of the Scriptures might have hope.” Accordingly we reject the following errors:

1. When it is taught, that God is not willing that all persons should come to repentance, and believe the Gospel.

2. Again, that when God calls us, it is not his earnest desire that all men should come to him.

3. Again, that God is not willing that all men should be saved, but without regard to their sins, solely through the bare counsel, purpose, and will of God, some are destined to damnation, so that they cannot be saved.

4. Again, that the mercy of God, and the most holy merit of Christ, are not the only cause of the election of God, but that in us also there is a cause, on account of which God has elected us to eternal life.

All these doctrines are false, odious, and blasphemous, by which all the consolation, which Christians have in the holy Gospel and in the use of the holy sacraments, is taken away from them; and for this reason these doctrines should not be tolerated in the church of God.

This is a brief and plain exposition of the controverted articles, which have been taught or discussed by the theologians of the Augsburg Confession for some time, with variations of sentiment among themselves. From this declaration every Christian, however inexperienced he may be, can perceive, according to the analogy of the Word of God and to the simple doctrine of the Catechism, the points which are true or false; since not only the pure doctrine is recited, but also the contrary and false doctrines are repudiated and rejected, and thus the controversies, which have arisen, and might occasion offence, are fully decided.

May the omnipotent God and Father of our Lord Jesus, grant the grace of his Holy Spirit, that we all may be united in him, and constantly remain in this Christian union, which is well-pleasing to him. Amen.

XII. OF SEVERAL FACTIONS AND SECTS,

WHICH NEVER EMBRACED THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

Lest by our silence, the opinions of these factions and sects, might be attributed to us also, since we have not made express mention of them in the preceding exposition, we have desired, in conclusion, only to recite the articles in which they err, and which they teach contrary to our oft-mentioned Christian Faith and Confession.

ERRONEOUS ARTICLES OF THE ANABAPTISTS.

The Anabaptists are divided into many sects, some of which adhere to more errors than others; but in general they profess a doctrine which cannot be tolerated in the ecclesiastical, or in the civil and political, or in the domestic relations of life.

Intolerable articles connected with ecclesiastical affairs.

1. That Christ did not derive his body and blood from the Virgin Mary, but brought the same from heaven with him.

2. That Christ is not true God, but only received greater gifts of the Holy Ghost, than any other holy man has received.

3. That our righteousness before God consists, not in the merits of Christ alone, but in our renewal, and consequently in the piety in which we walk. But this righteousness of the Anabaptists is, for the most part, founded on a sanctimoniousness which is of man's selection and invention; and in reality it is nothing else than a new species of Monkery.

4. That infants which are not baptized, are not sinners in the sight of God, but are righteous and innocent; which in their innocence, since they have not as yet the use of their reason, are saved without Baptism,—of which they have no need, according to the pretence of the Anabaptists. Thus they reject the whole doctrine concerning original sin, and all the truth depending on it.

5. That infants are not to be baptized, until they attain the use of their reason and are able to make a confession of faith themselves.

6. That the children of Christians, since they are born of Christian and believing parents, are holy and the children of God, even without and prior to baptism. For this reason they do not highly esteem Infant Baptism, nor promote it,—contrary to the express

words of the promise of God, which extends to those alone *who keep his covenant and do not despise it*, Gen. 17, 7, sqq.

7. That a church in which sinners are yet found, is not a true and Christian church.

8. That no one should frequent a temple, or hear a sermon in it, in which the Papistical mass had previously been read and celebrated.

9. That no one should have any intercourse with the ministers of the church, who preach the Gospel according to the Augsburg Confession and rebuke the sermons and errors of the Anabaptists; and that no one should serve them or labor for them, but flee from them and shun them as perverters of the Word of God.

Articles intolerable in civil and political affairs.

1. That the office of a magistrate is not a condition of life pleasing to God, under the New Testament dispensation.

2. That a Christian can neither hold nor administer the office of a magistrate with a good and inviolate conscience.

3. That a Christian may not, with an inviolate conscience, use the office of magistrate in occasional cases, against the wicked, nor may subjects invoke that power which magistrates have and receive from God, for their defence and protection.

4. That a Christian cannot, with a good conscience, swear an oath, nor take the oath of fealty to his prince or sovereign.

5. That the magistracy cannot, with an inviolate conscience, under the New Testament, inflict capital punishments on malefactors.

Articles intolerable in domestic life.

1. That a Christian can neither hold nor possess any property as his own, with a good conscience, but is under obligation to have all things common.

2. That a Christian cannot, with good conscience, be a landlord, nor a merchant, nor an armorer.

3. That married people may, on account of a difference in their faith, separate from each other, and each party may contract marriage with another who is of the same faith.

ERRONEOUS ARTICLES OF THE SCHWENKFELDIANS.

1. That all those, who maintain that Christ is a creature according to the flesh, have not a right knowledge of Christ the reigning King of heaven.

2, That the flesh of Christ, through his exaltation, has so assumed all the divine properties, that he—Christ—as man, in might, power, majesty, and glory, is equal to the Father and the Word in all respects in the grade and condition of his essence; so that now there are one and the same essence, property, will, and glory of both natures in Christ, and that the flesh of Christ belongs to the essence of the holy Trinity.

3. That the ministry of the Word, the preached and heard word, is not an instrument through which God the Holy Spirit teaches men, and produces in them the saving knowledge of Christ, conversion, repentance, faith, and new obedience.

4. That the water in Baptism is not a medium through which God the Lord seals our adoption as children of God and effects regeneration.

5. That bread and wine in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are not means through and with which Christ distributes his body and blood.

6. That a Christian who is truly regenerated through the Spirit of God, can keep and fulfil the law of God perfectly in this life.

7. That the church in which there is no public excommunication, or in which there is no regular process of excommunication maintained, is not a true Christian church.

8. That the minister of the church who is not truly renewed, regenerated, righteous, and pious in his own person, cannot teach other persons profitably, or administer true and genuine sacraments to them.

ERROR OF THE NEW ARIANS.

That Christ is not true, essential, natural God, of one eternal, divine essence with God the Father and the Holy Spirit, but is only adorned with divine majesty, subordinate and next to God the Father.

ERROR OF THE ANTITRINITARIANS.

Those who belong to this sect, which is a new one, unheard of before in the Christian church, believe, teach, and confess, that there is not one only eternal and divine essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but that even as God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, are three distinct persons, so also each person has his essence distinct and separate from the other persons in the Trinity. Of this sect, moreover, some think that each person in each essence

is of equal power, wisdom, majesty, and glory, like any three men, who, differing in number, are, with regard to their essence, discriminated and separated from each other. Others of them think that the three persons and essences are unequal to one another, in respect to their essence and properties, in such a mode that the Father alone is true God.

These, and all similar articles, and whatever errors besides attach to these and result from these, we condemn and reject as wrong, false, and heretical, and as repugnant to the Word of God, to the three Symbols, to the Augsburg Confession and its Apology, to the Articles of Smalcald, and to the Catechisms of Luther; against which errors all pious Christians, either of high or low degree, should guard themselves, as they value the salvation of their souls.

In confirmation that this is the doctrine, faith, and confession of us all, for which we shall answer on the last day before the just Judge, our Lord Jesus Christ, and against which we shall neither speak nor write any thing either secretly or publicly, but hope, by means of the grace of God, to adhere to them, we have, after due consideration, in the true fear of God, and after invoking his name, subscribed this Epitome with our own hands.

PART II.
A FULL DECLARATION;

OR

A COMPLETE, CLEAR, CORRECT, AND FINAL REPETITION AND DECLARATION OF CERTAIN ARTICLES OF THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION, CONCERNING WHICH, FOR SOME TIME, DISPUTES HAD BEEN MAINTAINED AMONG SOME THEOLOGIAN'S ATTACHED TO THAT CONFESSION; IN WHICH THESE DISPUTES ARE DETERMINED AND RECONCILED ACCORDING TO THE AUTHORITY OF THE WORD OF GOD, AND TO THE SUMMARY CONTENTS OF OUR CHRISTIAN DOCTRINE.

PREFACE.

By the inestimable goodness and mercy of Almighty God, the doctrine concerning the principal articles of our Christian religion, which had been shamefully obscured during the Papacy by the opinions and traditions of men, has now again been clearly unfolded and purified, according to the rule and analogy of the Word of God, by the labors of Dr. Luther, of blessed memory, while Papistical errors, abuses, and idolatry have been seriously rebuked. By this pious reformation, our adversaries supposed that new doctrines were introduced into the church of God; and as if this reformation were repugnant to the Word of God, and entirely subversive of all pious institutions, they assailed it with violence, but without truth, and loaded it with almost infinite calumnies, on grounds which were not even plausible. Influenced by this consideration, those electors, princes, and estates of the empire, who were distinguished by their piety, and who had at that time embraced the pure doctrine of the Gospel, and had reformed their own churches according to the rule of the Word of God, at the numerous and celebrated Diet of Augsburg, held A. D. 1530, carefully provided that a pious Confession, derived from the holy Scriptures, should be drawn up in writing; and they exhibited that confession to the emperor Charles V. In this they distinctly and unreservedly declared the points which were believed and publicly taught in the evangelical and reformed churches, in respect to the principal articles; (especially in respect to those articles which had become subjects of dispute between themselves and the Papists). Our adversaries received this Confession with great displeasure, indeed, but to this day they have not been able either to refute or to overthrow it.

Embracing with our whole heart this pious Augsburg Confession, built as it is upon the unshaken foundation of the Word of God, we now again publicly and solemnly profess it: and we adhere to that simple, pure, and perspicuous doctrine which its own expressions exhibit. We conceive it

to be the pious symbol of our day, which devout minds ought to adopt next to the invincible authority of the Word of God. In the same manner very serious religious controversies formerly arose in the church of God, and confessions and pious symbols were written, which sincere teachers and hearers embraced with their whole soul, and publicly professed. And indeed, assisted by the grace of Almighty God, we shall firmly persevere to the latest breath in the doctrine of this pious Confession, as it was exhibited to the emperor Charles V., A. D. 1530. Nor do we design in this or any other writing, to depart an hair-breadth from said Confession, or to frame a different or a new Confession.

But though the pious doctrine of this Confession, in general has met with no opposition, except that which proceeded from the Papists, it must be confessed that some theologians, in several articles of chief importance, have departed from it, and either have not arrived at its true sense, or have certainly failed to adhere to it uniformly; while some also have endeavored to affix to it a sense really foreign to it, who nevertheless professed that they embraced the Augsburg Confession, and pretended to glory in the profession of it. But from this circumstance very grievous and pernicious controversies arose in the reformed churches; as also formerly, while the Apostles were still living, shocking errors arose among those who desired to be esteemed Christians and who gloried in the doctrine of Christ. For some sought for justification and salvation through the works of the law, Acts 15, 1-29; others denied the resurrection of the dead, others did not believe that Christ is the true and eternal God. These men the Apostles zealously opposed in their discourses and their writings; although they were not ignorant that those errors and violent controversies on such important subjects, caused great offence among unbelievers as well as among those who were weak in the faith; just as our Papist adversaries at present exult on account of the dissensions which have arisen among us, cherishing a hope by no means pious, indeed a false hope, that the utter ruin and extinction of our sound doctrine must follow from our internal controversies. In the mean time weak persons are exceedingly offended and disturbed; some doubt whether, in the midst of these serious dissensions, the true doctrine can be found among us; some cannot decide to which party they ought to adhere in these controverted articles. For these controversies are not mere misunderstandings or vain and unnecessary disputes concerning words, such as often arise when one party has not fully understood the opinion of another, as perhaps in these religious transactions it may appear to be the case to some, who imagine that these disputes refer only to a few words which can surely be of no great importance. But these are very important subjects and are of such a nature, that the opinion of that party which departs from the truth, neither can be nor ought to be tolerated in the church of God—much less be excused or defended.

Wherefore necessity requires that these controverted articles should be distinctly explained from the Word of God, and from approved writings, so that all pious and intelligent persons may perceive whose opinion, in these controversies is conformable to the Word of God, and the orthodox Augsburg Confession, and what opinion is opposed to these approved writings; that good and pious minds, to whom truth is dear, may avoid and escape the corruptions and errors which have arisen.

OF THE COMPENDIOUS FORM, BASIS, STANDARD, AND RULE OF DOCTRINE, BY WHICH ALL DOCTRINES ARE TO BE DECIDED ACCORDING TO THE ANALOGY OF GOD'S WORD, AND ALL CONTROVERSIES WHICH HAVE ARISEN ARE TO BE EXPLAINED AND DETERMINED.

To establish entire and permanent harmony in the church of God, it is, first of all, necessary that a compendious formula and type, as it were, approved by unanimous consent, should exist, presenting the general doctrine, as derived from the Word of God, and as professed by the churches of the pure and reformed religion. In this matter indeed we follow the example of the primitive church, which always possessed certain symbols of its own, designed for such a use. But since such a compendious doctrinal symbol, or form, ought to be established, not upon private, but upon public writings, which have been drawn up, approved, and adopted in the name of those churches which unanimously profess the pure doctrine and religion, we have, therefore, in presence of one another, declared with one accord, and do now declare, that we have no intention to prepare or to receive any new or peculiar confession of faith; but rather we receive those public and general writings, which were always regarded as symbols and common confessions in all the churches of the Augsburg Confession, before dissensions arose among those who receive that Confession. And these writings also possessed public authority, as long as, in all quarters, the pure doctrine of the Word of God was unanimously preserved, retained, and applied in all its articles, as it was set forth by Dr. Luther.

1. We receive and adopt, with all the heart, the Prophetic and Apostolic writings of the Old and New Testaments, as the very clear and pure fountains of Israel; and we believe that those Sacred Writings alone are the sole and infallible rule by which all tenets ought to be tried, and according to which we ought to judge all doctrines as well as all teachers.

2. And since the pure doctrine of Christ, in its genuine and original sense, was collected long ago from the holy Scriptures, and comprised in articles, or very brief chapters, opposed to the corruptions of heretics, we receive also those three catholic and general symbols, which are of the highest authority, namely, the Apostolic, the Nicene, and the Athanasian symbols. We acknowledge these as brief, but Christian and most excellent confessions of faith, firmly established upon the Word of God, by which all the heresies, that disturbed the churches of Christ in those times, are clearly and successfully refuted.

3. Further, since, in these latter days, Almighty God, in great mercy, has by the faithful agency of that most pious and excellent man, Dr. Luther, restored the purity of his Word, which had been involved in gross darkness under the Papacy; and since that pure doctrine, as opposed not only to Popery, but also to the corruptions of other sects, has been comprised, agreeably to the Word of God, in the articles or several parts of the Augsburg Confession, we receive also the *original and unaltered Augsburg Confession*. And we do this, not because it was written by our theologians, but because it is drawn from the Word of God, and is firmly established on the foundation of the holy Scriptures, even as it was presented at Augsburg, in a written form, in the year 1530, to the emperor Charles V., by certain

electors, princes, and estates, of the Roman empire, as a common confession of the reformed churches. For we regard this as the symbol of our day, by which our reformed churches are distinguished from the Roman and other rejected and condemned sects and heresies. And indeed it was formerly the practice in the primitive church, that synods, subsequently held, and also bishops and teachers, always appealed to the Nicene Symbol, and publicly declared that they adopted it.

4. When it afterwards became necessary to provide that the proper and true sense of the Augsburg Confession should be maintained, and be more fully explained as well as protected against the calumnies of the Papists, in order that errors which had been condemned might not gradually insinuate themselves into the church of God, under the garb and patronage of the Augsburg Confession; therefore, after this Confession had been presented, the lucid *Apology* was written out at length, and printed in the year 1531. That *Apology* also we unanimously approve and receive, because in it not only is the Augsburg Confession clearly explained, and vindicated in respect to the calumnies of our adversaries, but it is also fortified by the clearest and most decisive evidences of the holy Scriptures.

5. Besides these, we receive with all the heart those articles also, which were written, approved, and adopted at Smalcald, by a very large number of theologians, at their meeting in the year 1537. By the Smalcald Articles we understand those which originally were written, and subsequently published, for the purpose of being presented at the Council to be held at Mantua, or elsewhere, in the name of the most illustrious electors, princes, and estates, of the empire, as a fuller explanation of the Augsburg Confession, to which they had determined, by the grace of God, to adhere with firmness. For in these articles, the doctrine of the Augsburg Confession is recapitulated, and in some places more fully presented from the Word of God; and besides, the grounds and grave reasons are set forth, on account of which we have withdrawn from Popish errors and idolatries, and, further, the reasons for which we cannot come to an agreement with the Pope of Rome, and unite with him in respect to these points.

6. Finally, as the subject of religion relates also to the salvation of the people, or of those who are called the laity, and as it is necessary, in view of their salvation, that they should distinguish the pure doctrine from the false, we receive also the Smaller and Larger Catechisms of Dr. Luther; that is, in the form in which they were written by him and inserted among his works. For all the churches of the Augsburg Confession, have approved and adopted these Catechisms; insomuch that they have, in all places, been used publicly in churches and schools, as well as in private families. In these Catechisms the Christian doctrine, derived from the Word of God, has been comprised and set forth, for the use of the laity, with the utmost perspicuity and simplicity.

These public writings, approved by all pious minds, have always been viewed, in the purer churches and schools, as a compend, outline, or form of that sound doctrine which Dr. Luther in his writings derived from the sacred Scriptures, with which he contended against Popery and other sects, and which he has clearly set forth and firmly established. And we appeal to the excellent explanations of Dr. Luther, comprehended in his polemic

as well as in his didactic writings, in that manner, namely, which Dr. Luther himself pointed out to us in reference to his writings, by way of pious and necessary advice, in his Latin preface, prefixed to his works. For there he makes, with great perspicuity, this distinction between divine and human writings: namely, that the sacred Scriptures alone are to be recognized as the sole rule and standard of all doctrines. and that the writings of no man whatever, are to be esteemed as equal to them, but rather that all are to be placed in subjection to them.

But these remarks are not to be understood as if we wish to reject or banish other useful and sound writings,—such as commentaries on the holy Scriptures, refutations of errors, or explanations of important articles. For these writings, in so far as they are conformed to the above-mentioned compend or outline of sound doctrine, can be retained and read with advantage, as useful explanations and statements. But whatever we have said hitherto concerning a compend or outline of sound doctrine, must be referred simply to the circumstance, that we need a definite form of doctrine approved by universal consent, which all our evangelical churches at once may recognize and adopt, and by which, as having been itself taken from the Word of God, all other writings may be tried or proved, which are set forth for our approbation and adoption.

We state that the above-mentioned writings, namely, the *Confession of Augsburg, the Apology, the Articles of Smalcald, and the Smaller and Larger Catechisms* of Luther, contain the sum or substance of our Christian doctrine, because it has always been adjudged that they present the common or unanimously received doctrines of our church, since these writings were confirmed by the most distinguished and excellent theologians of those times, and both received their signatures and also were adopted in the evangelical churches and schools. They were also written and published, as we have already intimated, before those controversies arose among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession; consequently no portion of their contents was influenced by party-feeling, and on this account they cannot with justice be rejected by those among whom differences of opinion have since arisen. And, indeed, no one will impair or condemn their authority, who sincerely and without disguise adopts the Augsburg Confession, but will receive them as witnesses of the truth. Hence, no one can censure us for appealing to the explanations and decisions of those writings, in disposing of the controversies which have arisen. For even as the foundation which we lay is the immutable truth of God's Word, so these writings are set forth by us, as witnesses of the truth, comprising the unanimously-received and sound doctrine of our ancestors, who remained steadfast in the pure faith.

OF POINTS OF CONTROVERSY, OR THE REJECTION OF FALSE DOCTRINES.

To preserve the pure doctrine in the church, and also that perfect and durable harmony which is acceptable and pleasing to God, it is necessary, not only that the true doctrine should be accurately set forth, but also that those, who oppose it and teach a different doctrine, should be refuted. For, as Dr. Luther said, it is the duty of the faithful shepherd both to feed the sheep and to repel the wolf, so that the sheep may learn to flee from the

voice of a stranger, and be able to distinguish the precious from the vile, 1 Tim. 3; 2 Tim. 3, 16; Tit. 1, 9; John 10, 12; Jer. 15, 19.

Consequently, on this point also, we have in the presence of one another distinctly declared, and now we declare [our opinion,] that a distinction ought to be made between those unnecessary and useless contentions, on the one hand, which destroy rather than build up, (in order that the church may not be disturbed by them,) and those necessary struggles, on the other hand, which take place when controversies arise concerning articles of faith, or important portions of the Christian doctrine; since a contrary and false doctrine must then be refuted of necessity, for the purpose of defending the truth.

Now, although the writings named above, exhibit in a perspicuous and lucid manner, to the pious reader who glows with the love of divine truth, those points, in every article of our Christian religion, which are to be embraced, according to the standard of the Word of God, namely, the writings of the Prophets and Apostles, and also those points which are false and which ought to be rejected and avoided; nevertheless we have desired to set forth our views, distinctly and without any ambiguity, especially in reference to those important and leading articles which in these days have been the subjects of controversy. And in adopting this course, our object has been that the truth should shine forth more clearly, be acknowledged more readily, and be distinguished more easily from erroneous opinions, so that nothing which could obstruct the truth, might lie concealed under words or phrases too indefinite or general; and likewise, in order that a public and positive testimony might be furnished, not only to those who are now living, but also to posterity, showing what the unanimous opinion and judgment of our churches had been, and perpetually ought to be, concerning those controverted articles,—namely:

1. First, we reject and condemn all heresies and errors, which in the primitive or orthodox church were rejected and condemned, according to the positive and fundamental truths of God's Word.

2. Further, we reprobate and condemn all sects and heresies, which are reprobated in the above-mentioned writings of our church.

3. Moreover, since within the last thirty years, disputes have arisen among some theologians of the Augsburg Confession, partly from the *Interim*,* and partly from other circumstances, it has been our desire to declare and set forth positively and distinctly our faith and confession, in reference to all these particulars, not only in affirmative, (thetical) but also in negative (antithetical) propositions; namely, the true and the false doctrine contrasted. We have adopted this course, in order that the solid foundations of divine truth might be more distinctly perceived in every article, and that all false, ambiguous, doubtful, and condemned opinions, in whatever books they may be contained, and by whomsoever these may have been written, or be at present defended, might be decidedly repudiated; so

* The name given to the Edict of the emperor Charles V., published in 1548, and designating the doctrine, ceremonies, &c., which should be maintained in the churches in Germany, during the interval between its publication and the formal decisions of a general Council.—[TRANS.]

that in reference to errors which ought to be shunned, and which occur in the books of some theologians, all might be faithfully forewarned and might guard against being led astray in matters of such importance, by the authority of any man. If the pious reader will carefully weigh our explanation of the controversies, and compare it with the writings to which we have several times alluded, he will clearly perceive that those views, which our ancestors at first adopted, and publicly professed in reference to every article in that compendious system of our religion and faith, as well as those declarations which, at particular periods, followed each other after certain intervals, and also that doctrine which we now recapitulate in this writing, by no means, differ from each other, but that they are the simple, immutable, and most certain truth. And the candid reader will acknowledge, that we do not pass lightly from one doctrine to another, with the fickleness of which our adversaries accuse us; but that it is rather our effort to adhere firmly to the confession already exhibited at Augsburg, as well as to the true and Christian sense, unanimously assigned to it, and that we steadfastly persist in that doctrine, by the grace of God, in opposition to all the corruptions which have been attempted.

I. OF ORIGINAL SIN.

Thus, a controversy has arisen among some theologians of the Augsburg Confession, concerning original sin, that is, with respect to the question:—In what does it properly consist? The one party contended, that inasmuch as the nature and essence of man are totally corrupted through the fall of Adam, therefore, since the fall, the nature, substance, and essence of corrupt man, or certainly the principal and noblest part of his essence, that is, the rational soul, in its highest grade or most eminent powers, is original sin itself; which is called natural or personal sin, because it is not a thought, word, or deed, but nature itself, from which, as from their root, all other sins proceed; and that, consequently, at present, since the fall, inasmuch as man's nature is corrupted by sin, there is no difference whatever between the nature or essence of man and original sin.

In opposition to these views, however, the other party taught that original sin is not properly the nature, substance, or essence of man, that is, the body or soul of man, which even now since the fall are and remain the work and creatures of God in us; but that it is something in the nature, body, soul, and all the powers of man, namely, a horrible, deep, and inexpressible corruption of hu-

man nature ; insomuch that man is destitute of that righteousness, in which he was created in the beginning, and, in spiritual matters, is dead to every thing that is good, and inclined to all that is evil ; and that, in consequence of this corruption and inborn sin which is seated in human nature, all actual sins flow from the heart ; and that, consequently, a distinction must always be made between the nature and essence of corrupt man, or his body and soul,—which even after the fall are the work and creatures of God in us,—and original sin which is a work of the devil, through which man's nature became corrupt.

Now this dispute concerning original sin, is not an unnecessary contest ; for when this doctrine is correctly set forth, according to the Word of God, and separated from all Pelagian and Manichean errors, the benefits of Christ the Lord, (as the Apology declares,) his precious merits, and also the gracious operations of the Holy Spirit, will be the better perceived and the more highly commended. And the praise due to God will also be ascribed to him, when his work and the results of his creation in man are rightly distinguished from the work of the devil, through which our nature became corrupt. For the purpose, therefore, of explaining this controversy in a Christian manner, and according to the Word of God, and, also, of preserving the sound and pure doctrine concerning original sin, we will transfer from the above-mentioned writings, and state the doctrine, in short paragraphs, thetically and antithetically, that is, both the sound doctrine and also the erroneous or opposite doctrine.

1. And, in the first place, it is true, that Christians should not only regard and acknowledge the actual transgression of the commandments of God as a sin, but that they ought, above all things, to regard and acknowledge that horrible and abominable hereditary disease also, by which man's whole nature became corrupt, as truly a sin, and, indeed, as the principal sin, which is the root and fountain of all actual sins. And this evil is called by Dr. Luther, "*eine Natur oder Person-Sünde*," that is, "the sin of man's nature or person," in order to indicate, that, even if man thought, spoke, or did no evil, (which however, since the fall of our first parents, it is impossible that man should accomplish in the present life of human nature,) his nature and person would nevertheless be sinful ; that is, through original sin, as a spiritual leprosy, he is wholly and entirely poisoned and corrupted in the sight of God. On account of this corruption, and in consequence of the fall of our first parents, the nature or person of man is accused and condemned by

the law of God, so that we are by nature the children of wrath, death, and condemnation, (Eph. 2, 3,) if we are not redeemed from these evils through the merits of Christ.

2. In the second place, it is also clear and true, as the nineteenth article of the Augsburg Confession teaches, that God is not a creator, author, or cause of sin; but through the instigation of Satan, sin (which is a work of the devil) entered into the world, by one man, Rom. 5, 12; 1 John 3, 8. And even at the present time, in this condition of man, God does not create and cause sin in us; but in connection with that nature, which God creates in men at the present time, original sin is propagated through natural conception and birth, by father and mother, from sinful seed.

3. In the third place, mere human reason cannot know and understand the extent of this hereditary evil, but, as the Articles of Smalcald declare, it must be learned and believed from the revelation of the Scriptures. The chief points are briefly set forth in the Apology, in the following manner:

1. That this hereditary evil is guilt, inasmuch that all men, in consequence of the disobedience of Adam and Eve, are subject to the displeasure of God, and are the children of wrath by nature, as the Apostle testifies, Rom. 5, 12, &c.; Eph. 2, 3.

2. In the second place, that it is also a total defect or privation of the connate hereditary righteousness in Paradise, or of the image of God, after which man was originally created in truth, holiness, and righteousness; and at the same time it is an inability and an unfitness for all spiritual things; or, as it is expressed in Latin: *Descriptio peccati originalis detrahit naturæ non renovatæ et dona et vim seu facultatem et actus inchoandi et efficiendi spiritualia*; that is, the description of original sin takes from unrenewed nature, both the gifts and the power, or ability to begin and to accomplish any thing in spiritual matters.

3. Thirdly, that original sin in human nature is not only this entire want of all that is good in spiritual and divine things; but that it is also, instead of the lost image of God in man, a deep, evil, horrible, fathomless, unsearchable, and unspeakable corruption of the whole nature and of all the powers of man, especially of the noblest and most eminent faculties of the soul, in the understanding, the heart, and the will; inasmuch that now, since the fall, man inherits an innate evil disposition, and an inward impurity of heart, evil desires and inclinations; so that by nature we all inherit a heart, mind, and thoughts, from Adam, which, in respect to their highest powers and the light of reason, are diametrically opposed to God by nature,

and to his chief commands, and indeed are at enmity with God, especially with respect to divine and spiritual things. For, in other respects, that is, in those natural and external matters which are subject to reason, man still possesses, to some extent, powers and ability, very much impaired however, being likewise infected and polluted by original sin, so that they avail nothing before God.

4. Fourthly, the punishments which God has imposed on the children of Adam on account of original sin, are death, everlasting damnation, and other bodily and spiritual, temporal and eternal miseries, the tyranny and dominion of Satan; so that human nature is subject to the kingdom of the devil, given over to his power, and held captive under his dominion; he deceives and seduces many great and wise men in the world, by horrible errors, heresies, and manifold blindness, and also plunges men into all manner of vice.

5. In the fifth place, this hereditary evil is so great and horrible, that it can be covered and pardoned before God in those who are baptized and who believe, in no other way than for the sake of Christ the Lord alone. And human nature, which is perverted and corrupted by this evil, must and can be healed only through the regeneration and renewal of the Holy Spirit. This work, however, of the Holy Spirit, is only commenced in this life, but in the life to come it will be perfected.

These points, which we have here presented only in a summary manner, are more copiously explained in the above-mentioned writings, which constitute the general confession of our Christian doctrine.

This doctrine, however, must be so maintained and guarded as to incline neither to Pelagian nor to Manichean errors. We shall therefore also briefly recite the doctrines contrary to this article, which are exposed and rejected by our churches.

1. We reject and condemn, in opposition to the ancient and modern Pelagians, the following false opinions and doctrines:—That original sin is only a *reatus* or guilt contracted by the offence of another, without any corruption of our own nature.

2. That sinful or evil lusts are not sin, but certain *conditions* or concreated and essential properties of nature.

3. Or that the defect, the hereditary evil mentioned above, is not properly and truly a sin before God, on account of which, man, when out of Christ, is a child of wrath and of condemnation, and is also in the kingdom and under the power of Satan.

4. Also, the following and other Pelagian errors like them, are exposed and rejected; namely, that the nature of man, even after

the fall, is uncorrupt, and entirely good and pure in *suis naturalibus*, that is, in its natural powers, especially as to spiritual things.

5. Or, that original sin is a mere external, unimportant spot or blemish adhering to nature; *vel corruptio tantum accidentium aut qualitatum*, that is, a corruption only of certain *accidents* [not essential parts] and properties in the nature of man, with and under which however, nature possesses and retains, even in spiritual matters, its excellence and its powers.

6. Or, that original sin is not a spoliation or deprivation, but only an outward impediment of our good, unimpaired, spiritual powers; as when a magnet is overspread with garlic-juice, by which its natural power is not taken away, but only obstructed; or that this blemish, like a stain in the face or paint on the wall, can be easily washed off.

7. We in like manner rebuke and reject those who teach, that the nature of man was indeed very much debilitated and corrupted through the fall, but that it has, nevertheless, not entirely lost all that is good with respect to divine and spiritual things, and also that the sentiment is not true, in our church hymn:

“ This human frame, this soul, this all,
Is all corrupt through Adam’s fall; ”

But that on the contrary, man from his natural birth still possesses something that is good, however little, feeble, and insignificant it may be; for instance, capacity, skill, fitness, or ability to begin a work, to act, or to co-operate, in spiritual things. For in reference to external, temporal, and secular business or affairs, which are subject to reason, we shall give an explanation in the succeeding article.

This doctrine and others alike erroneous, are reprehended and rejected, because the Word of God teaches, that our corrupt nature of itself and by its own powers, is unable to accomplish any good thing, even in the least degree, in spiritual and divine matters, such as, to think a good thought; and not only so, but that of itself and by its own powers, it can do nothing in the sight of God but sin, Gen. 6, 5; 8, 21.

But, on the other hand, this doctrine must be secured also against the errors of the Manicheans. Therefore, this doctrine also and other erroneous doctrines like it, are rejected, namely:— That human nature had been created pure and good at first, but that afterwards original sin had been infused into it from without, as an essential part of it, by Satan, and intermingled with it, as poison may be mingled with wine.

For, although the nature in Adam and Eve was originally created

pure, good, and holy, yet through the fall, sin did not enter into their nature in the manner in which the Manicheans have imagined irrationally, as if Satan had created or made some substantial evil, and mingled it with their nature. But when, by the seduction of Satan, through the fall, according to the judgment and sentence of God for the punishment of man, he had lost the original or con-created righteousness, human nature, as stated above, became so perverted and corrupt by this privation or want, and by the wounding and injury effected by Satan, that now this nature, with the same defect and corruption, descends by inheritance to all men who are conceived and born of parents in the natural manner. For, since the fall, human nature is not first created pure and holy, and then corrupted by original sin; but in the first moment of our conception, the seed out of which man is formed, is sinful and corrupt. And thus, too, original sin is not something subsisting of itself, in or apart from the nature of corrupt man; even as also it is not the essence, the body or soul of corrupt man, nor man himself. Neither can nor should original sin and human nature which is corrupted by it, be so distinguished, as if this nature were pure, good, holy, and incorrupt before God, and original sin alone which dwells in nature, were evil.

Further, we reject the opinion entertained by the Manicheans, as Augustine relates, according to which corrupt man himself does not sin in consequence of his connate original sin, but some other foreign thing in man; and that consequently God does not, through the law, accuse and condemn man's nature, as corrupted by this sin, but only original sin, which exists in it. For, as we have stated above in the *thesis* or declaration of the pure doctrine concerning original sin, the whole nature of man, born in the natural manner, of father and mother, is totally corrupted and perverted by original sin, to the utmost extent, in body and soul, in all his powers, (as far as relates to the goodness, truth, holiness, and righteousness created in man in Paradise.) *Non tamen in aliam substantiam genere aut specie diversam, priori abolita, transmutata est.* That is:—This nature however, is not wholly and entirely destroyed, or changed into another substance which according to its essence is not similar to our nature, and consequently not of one essence with us.

In consequence also of this corruption, the entire corrupt nature of man is accused and condemned by the law, unless sin is remitted for Christ's sake.

The law, however, accuses and condemns our nature, not because

we are persons created of God, but because we are sinful and evil ; nor because, and in so far as nature and its essence in us, even after the fall, is a work and creature of God, but because, and so far as it is infected and corrupted through sin.

But, although original sin (as Luther says) has infected and corrupted the whole nature of man, like a spiritual poison and leprosy, so that now in our corrupt nature, these two, nature itself, and original sin in it, cannot be clearly distinguished, separately, the one from the other ; nevertheless corrupt nature, on the one hand, or the essence of corrupt man, his body and soul, or man himself who is created of God, (and in whom original sin dwells, by which the nature, essence, or the whole man, is corrupted,) and original sin itself, on the other hand, which dwells in the nature or essence of man, and corrupts the same, are not one and the same thing ; even as in external leprosy, the body which is leprous, and the leprosy which is in or on the body, are not, properly speaking, the same thing. For a distinction must be observed between our nature, as it is created and preserved of God, in which sin dwells, and original sin which dwells in nature ; these two, according to the holy Scriptures, must and can be considered, taught, and believed, with their proper distinction.

The principal articles of our Christian faith, urge and enforce the observance of this distinction. In the first place, in the article of faith concerning creation, the Scriptures testify that God created human nature not only before the fall, but that it remains a creature and a work of God, even after the fall. (Deut. 32, 6 ; Isa. 45, 11 ; 54, 5 ; 64, 8 ; Acts 17, 25 ; Rev. 4, 11.)

“Thine hands,” says Job, “have made me, and fashioned me together round about ; yet thou dost destroy me. Remember, I beseech thee, that thou hast made me as the clay ; and wilt thou bring me into dust again ? Hast thou not poured me out as milk, and curdled me like cheese ? Thou hast clothed me with skin and flesh, and hast fenced me with bones and sinews. Thou hast granted me life and favor, and thy visitation hath preserved my spirit ;” Job 10, 8–12.

“I will praise thee ;” says David, “for I am fearfully and wonderfully made : marvellous are thy works ; and that my soul knoweth right well. My substance was not hid from thee, when I was made in secret, and curiously wrought in the lowest parts of the earth. Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect ; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them ;” Psalm 139, 14–16.

“Then shall the dust,” says Solomon, “return to the earth as it was; and the spirit shall return unto God who gave it;” Eccl. 12, 7.

These passages testify clearly, that God is the creator of man even after the fall, and that he creates his body and soul. Therefore corrupt man cannot, without any distinction, be sin itself, else God would be a creator of sin. Thus also our Smaller Catechism testifies in the explanation of the first Article, where it is thus written: “I believe that God created me, together with every other creature; that he has given and still preserves for me my body and soul, eyes and ears, and all the other members, reason and all the senses.” And it is also written in the Larger Catechism: “I mean and believe, that I am a creature of God; that is, that he has given me, and continually preserves, my body, soul, and life, and all my members, my senses, reason, and understanding,” &c. Yet this creature and work of God is miserably corrupted by sin; for, the substance out of which God now forms and makes human beings, was corrupted and perverted in Adam, and thus reaches us by inheritance.

And here pious Christians should justly acknowledge the unspeakable goodness of God, that he does not at once cast away from himself this corrupted, perverted, sinful mass into hell, but that he still forms and makes out of it the present human nature, which is so miserably corrupted by sin; in order that he may purify it from sin, sanctify, and save it through his beloved Son.

From this article accordingly, that distinction appears clearly and incontrovertibly; for original sin does not proceed from God; God is not the creator or author of sin; neither is original sin a creature or a work of God, but it is the work of the devil.

Now, if there were no difference whatever, between the nature and essence of our body and soul, which are corrupted by original sin, and original sin itself, through which nature is corrupted, it would follow, either that God, since he is the creator of our nature, has also created and made original sin, and this too would thus become his work and creature; or, since sin is a work of the devil, that Satan is the creator of our nature, body and soul, which would then be a work or a creature of Satan, if without any distinction our corrupt nature were sin itself. Both of these positions, however, are repugnant to the first Article of our Christian faith. In order, therefore, that the creature and work of God in man, may be distinguished from the work of the devil, we say that the body and soul of man are the work or creature of God, and that the ability in man to think, to speak, to act, and to operate, is the work of God. “For in him we live, and move, and have our being,” Acts 17, 28. But that his

nature is corrupted, and that his thoughts, words, and works are evil—this is originally the work of Satan, who has thus corrupted the work of God in Adam through sin, which reaches us by inheritance.

In the second place, in the article concerning redemption, the Scriptures testify forcibly, that the Son of God assumed our human nature, without sin, however, so that in all things, sin excepted, he was made like unto us, his brethren, Heb. 2, 17. *Unde veteres dixerunt: Christum nobis, fratribus suis, consubstantialtem esse secundum assumptam naturam, quia naturam, quæ, excepto peccato, ejusdem generis, speciei et substantiæ cum nostra est, assumpsit, et contrariam sententiam manifeste hæreseos damnarunt.* That is:—Hence all the ancient orthodox teachers held, that Christ according to his assumed humanity, is of one essence with us, his brethren; for he assumed a human nature, which, with the exception of sin, is entirely like our human nature in its essence, and in all its essential properties; and they condemned the contrary doctrine, as a manifest heresy.

Now, if there were no difference between the nature or essence of corrupt man and original sin, it would necessarily follow, either that Christ did not assume our nature, because he did not assume sin; or, since he assumed our nature, that he also assumed sin: both of these conclusions are repugnant to the Scriptures. But since the Son of God assumed our human nature, and not original sin, it is hence clear that human nature, even after the fall, and original sin, are not one and the same thing, but that they must be distinguished.

In the third place, in the article concerning sanctification, the Scriptures teach, that God cleanses men from sin, (1 John 1, 7,) purifies, and sanctifies them, and that Christ saves his people from their sins, (Matt. 1, 21.) Therefore, sin cannot be man himself; for God receives men in mercy for Christ's sake, but he forever remains an enemy to sin. Hence, this expression with others similar to it, which we find in the writings of the modern Manicheans—that original sin is baptized in the name of the holy Trinity, is sanctified, and saved—is unchristian and abominable. All these, however, we do not wish to recite, as they are offensive to Christian people.

In the fourth place, in the article concerning the resurrection, the Scriptures testify, that the substance even of our flesh, shall rise,—but free from sin; and that in the life everlasting, we shall have and retain the same soul,—but free from sin.

Now, if there were no difference at all between our corrupted body and soul, and original sin, it would follow, in opposition to this

article of the Christian faith, either that our flesh will not rise on the last day, and that in eternal life we shall possess, not this essence of our bodies and souls, but a different substance and another soul, since we shall then be without sin; or, that sin will also rise, and exist, and remain in the elect, in that eternal life.

Hence it is clear, that this doctrine, with all the opinions which are dependent and consequent upon it, must be rejected, namely, when it is asserted and taught, that original sin is the nature, substance, essence, body, or soul of corrupt man; so that there is no difference at all between original sin, and our corrupt nature, substance, and essence. For the principal articles of our Christian faith testify forcibly and powerfully, as to the reasons for which a difference between the nature and substance of man, corrupted by sin, and sin itself by which and through which man is corrupted, shall and must be retained. These statements may suffice as a simple declaration of the true doctrine, and the contrary doctrine, (thetically and antithetically,) concerning this controversy, so far as it concerns the principal matter itself, as it is not here designed to engage in an extended discussion, but only to treat the principal subjects, article by article.

But in relation to words and phrases, it is best and safest to use and retain the form of sound words employed in the holy Scriptures, and in the writings mentioned above, concerning this article.

For the purpose of avoiding contentions about words, those equivocal terms or words and phrases which are understood and used in various senses, must be diligently and clearly explained. Thus, when it is said, "God creates the nature of man;" by the word *nature* we understand, the essence, the body and the soul of man. But frequently the character, the defects or evils of an object are called its nature, as when it is said, "It is the nature of the serpent to sting and to poison." In this sense Luther says, that *sin* or *to sin* is the quality and nature of corrupt man.

Original sin is, therefore, properly that deep corruption of our nature, as it is described in the Smalcald Articles. Sometimes, however, as a *concrete* term, it comprehends the subject also, that is, man himself with his body and soul, in whom sin exists and inheres, because man is corrupted, infected, and contaminated through sin; as, when Luther says: "Thy birth, thy nature, and thy whole being, is sin," that is, sinful and impure.

And when Luther uses these words: "Natural, personal, essential sin," he himself explains his meaning to be, that not only the words, thoughts, and deeds are sins, but, that the whole nature, per-

son, and essence of man, are totally and thoroughly corrupted by original sin.

But in regard to the Latin words *substantia* and *accidens*, since they are not understood by unlearned persons, they should not be used in our churches in public discourses. But when the learned use them in reference to the present subject among themselves, or before others who understand them,—as Eusebius, Ambrose, and especially Augustine, as well as other eminent teachers of the church, have done through necessity, for the purpose of explaining this doctrine in opposition to the heretics,—they employ them as terms which complete the description, or as alternatives, which exclude the existence of a third term between them; so that all that exists, must either be a substance, (*substantia*,) that is, something which exists by itself, or an accident, (*accidens*,) that is, a property which does not subsist essentially by itself, but in another essence, which subsists by itself, and from which it can be distinguished. This division is used also by Cyril and Basil.

And inasmuch as it is an indubitable and incontestable axiom, among others, in theology, that every substance, or thing subsisting by itself, so far as it is a substance, is either God himself, or a work and creature of God, Augustine has, in a number of publications against the Manicheans, like all true teachers, for sufficient reasons and with earnestness, condemned and rejected this expression: *Peccatum originis est substantia vel natura*; that is, original sin is the nature or substance of man. And with him all the learned and the intelligent have ever held, that whatever does not subsist by itself, or is not a part of another essence subsisting by itself, but, seated in something else, is subject to change, is not properly called *substantia*, that is, something subsisting by itself, but *accidens*, that is, a mere quality, or something contingent. Thus Augustine was always accustomed to express himself in this manner: “Original sin is not our nature itself, but it is *accidens vitium in natura*, that is, an accidental defect and evil in our nature.” And this manner of expression was used freely, and without any suspicion [of heresy,] in our schools and churches, according to the rules of dialectics, before this controversy commenced; and hence it was never reprehended either by Dr. Luther or by any sound teacher in our evangelical churches.

Since, then, it is an incontestable truth, that all that exists is either a substance, or a quality, that is, either an essence subsisting by itself, or an attribute of the same, as it was shown and proved above by the testimonies of ecclesiastical writers, and no one of sane

mind ever doubted it ; necessity forces us, without the possibility of evasion, in case it be asked whether original sin is a substance, that is, a thing which exists by itself, and not in another ; or an attribute, that is, a quality which does not subsist by itself, but inheres in another object, and cannot subsist by itself—to confess in a direct manner, that original sin is not a substance, but an attribute or accident.

Hence, the church of God can never be restored to permanent peace in reference to this controversy, but disunion will be much more confirmed and perpetuated, if her ministers remain in doubt whether original sin is a substance or an attribute, and whether it should correctly and properly be called a substance, or an attribute or accident.

If, then, our churches and schools are to be wholly freed from this offensive and most pernicious controversy, it is necessary that every one should be properly informed concerning this matter.

But if it be further asked—what kind of attribute or accident original sin is? an entirely different question is proposed, of which no philosopher, no Papist, no sophist, yea, not human reason, however acute it may be, can furnish the right solution ; but all our understanding and explanation of it must be derived from the holy Scriptures alone ; which testify, that original sin is an inexpressible evil, and such a corruption of human nature that nothing pure or good remains in it, or in any of its interior or exterior faculties, but that it is altogether depraved ; so that through original sin, man is truly dead in the sight of God, spiritually, and, with all his powers, has become dead to every thing that is good.

By the use of the word *accidens*, therefore, original sin is not extenuated, if it be thus explained according to the Word of God, even as Dr. Luther in his Latin Commentary on the third chapter of Genesis, has written with great zeal against such doctrines as extenuate original sin. But this word serves merely to show the difference between the work of God, which is our own nature notwithstanding it is corrupt, and the work of the devil, which is sin inhering in the work of God, or its most deep and inexpressible corruption.

Thus Luther also used the word *accidens* as well as *qualitas* on this subject, and did not reject them. But at the same time, he showed with special correctness and great zeal, and impressed on the minds of all, what an odious quality or *accidens* it is, through which human nature is not simply made unclean, but is so deeply corrupted, that nothing pure or incorrupt remains in it ; as his words on the ninetyeth Psalm declare : *Sive igitur peccatum originale qualitatem, sive morbum vocaverimus, profecto extremum malum est,*

non solum pati æternam iram et mortem, sed ne agnoscere quidem, quæ pateris. That is, whether we call original sin a quality or a disease, it is truly the highest evil, that we should not only suffer the eternal wrath of God and everlasting death, but not even understand what we suffer. And again, in his Commentary on the third chapter of Genesis he says: *Qui isto veneno peccati originis, a planta pedis usque ad verticem infecti sumus, siquidem in natura adhuc integra hæc accidere, &c.* That is, by the poison of original sin, we are infected from the sole of the foot even unto the crown of the head, since these things occurred when nature was still uncorrupt, &c.

II. OF FREEWILL, OR THE POWERS OF MAN.

Inasmuch as a controversy has arisen, not only between us and the Papists, but among some theologians of the Augsburg Confession also, concerning freewill, we shall, first of all, exhibit the points which were called in question.

Since man, in respect to his freewill, may be considered in four very different states, the inquiry now does not relate to the condition of his will *before the fall*, nor to the extent of his ability *since the fall, prior to his conversion*, in external matters pertaining to this temporal life; nor does it relate to the condition of his will in spiritual matters, either *after he is regenerated* through the Spirit of God and ruled by him, or *when he shall have been raised from the dead*; but the chief question is solely:—What the understanding and will of unregenerate man can accomplish in his conversion and regeneration, by his own powers remaining since the fall, when the Word of God is preached, and the grace of God is offered to us; whether he can prepare himself for the apprehension of this grace, accept it, and give assent to the Word of God. This is the controversy which has been maintained for many years in the churches of the Augsburg Confession, among some theologians.

For the one party held and taught, that although man is unable by his own powers to fulfil the commandments of God, to confide truly in him, to fear him, and to love him truly, without the grace of the Holy Spirit; yet that he still retains so much of natural power, prior to his regeneration, that he can in some measure prepare himself for grace and assent to it,—though feebly: but if the grace of the Holy Spirit be not added, he can accomplish nothing by that power, but must be overcome in the struggle.

On the other hand, certain enthusiasts, both ancient and modern,

have also taught, that God converts sinners through his Spirit, and draws them to the saving knowledge of Christ, without any instrumentality of the creature,—that is, without the external preaching and hearing of the Word of God.

In opposition to both these parties, the pure teachers of the Augsburg Confession have taught and contended, that through the fall of our first parents, man became so corrupt, that he is blind by nature in divine things pertaining to our conversion and the salvation of our souls, neither understanding nor being able to understand the Word of God when it is preached, but regarding it as foolishness; and that he does not approach God of himself, but remains an enemy to him until he is converted, is made a believer, is regenerated, and renewed by the power of the Holy Spirit, through the preaching and hearing of the Word, out of pure grace, without any co-operation on his own part.

For the purpose of explaining this controversy in a Christian manner, according to the analogy of the Word of God, and by his grace of deciding it, we state that our doctrine, faith, and confession, are the following:

Namely, that in spiritual and divine things, the understanding, the heart, and the will of unregenerate man, are unable, by their own natural powers, to understand, to believe, to accept, to think, to will, to begin, to accomplish, to do, to perform, or to co-operate in any thing whatever; but are wholly and entirely corrupted, and dead to every thing good; so that in the nature of man, since the fall, and prior to his regeneration, not a spark of spiritual power remains or exists by which he can prepare himself for the grace of God, or accept the offered grace, or be capable thereof, or apply himself, or accommodate himself to it, of and by himself. Nor is he able by his own powers to help, to do, to perform, or to co-operate in any thing towards his conversion, either as to the whole of it or any part, even in the least or most insignificant part; but he is the servant of sin, John 8, 34, and the captive of Satan, by whom he is led, Eph. 2, 2; 2 Tim. 2, 26. Hence the natural freewill, according to its perverted nature and character, is efficient and active in that alone which displeases God and is opposed to him.

This explanation and general reply to the chief question and point of controversy mentioned in the introduction of this article, is established and confirmed by the following arguments, which we derive from the Word of God. And although they be opposed to the pride of reason and the philosophy of man, yet we know that the wisdom of this perverted world is only foolishness in the sight of God, and

that in respect to articles of faith we must judge according to the Word of God alone.

For, *in the first place*, although human reason, or the natural understanding of man, may have a feeble spark of the knowledge of the existence of God, and also of the law, Rom. 1, 19; 2, 15; still, it is so ignorant, blind, and perverted, that, even when the most ingenious and learned persons on earth, read or hear the Gospel concerning the Son of God, and the promise of everlasting salvation, they are nevertheless unable by their own powers to perceive, or to comprehend, or to understand, or to believe these things, and to hold them as truth, but rather, the greater diligence and assiduity they employ in this respect to comprehend these spiritual things with their reason, the less they understand or believe; and they regard all as mere foolishness or fables, before they are illuminated and taught by the Holy Spirit. 1 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man receiveth not the things of the Spirit of God; for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them, because they are spiritually discerned." 1 Cor. 1, 21: "For after that, in the wisdom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe." Eph. 4, 17, 18: Those who are not regenerated through the Holy Spirit, "walk in the vanity of their mind; having the understanding darkened, being alienated from the life of God, through the ignorance that is in them, because of the blindness of their heart." Matt. 13, 11, 13: "They seeing, see not; and hearing, they hear not; neither do they understand." But "it is given unto you to know the mysteries of the kingdom of heaven." Rom. 3, 11, 12: "There is none that understandeth, there is none that seeketh after God. They are all gone out of the way, they are together become unprofitable; there is none that doeth good, no, not one." Thus the Scriptures at once call the natural man, "darkness" in spiritual and divine things, Eph. 5, 8; Acts 26, 18; John 1, 5: "And the light shineth in darkness," (that is, in this dark, blind world which neither knows nor regards God,) "and the darkness comprehended it not." Again, the Scriptures teach, that man is not only weak and diseased, but entirely inanimate and dead in sins, Eph. 2, 1, 5; Col. 2, 13.

Now, as a man, who is physically dead, cannot by his own powers fit or prepare himself so as to obtain temporal life again; so a man, who is spiritually dead in sins, cannot by his own powers, adapt or prepare himself for the attainment of spiritual and heavenly righteousness and life, if he be not made free from the death of sin, and made alive by the Son of God.

The Scriptures, therefore, take from the understanding, the heart, and the will of the natural man, all aptitude, capacity, ability, and power, to think, understand, accomplish, begin, will, propose, do, operate, or co-operate in any thing that is good and right in spiritual things, as of himself. 2 Cor. 3, 5: "Not that we are sufficient of ourselves to think any thing as of ourselves; but our sufficiency is of God." Rom. 3, 12: "They are together become unprofitable." John 8, 37: "My word hath no place in you." John 1, 5: The "darkness, comprehended it not," or received it not. 1 Cor. 2, 14: "The natural man receiveth not," or as the Greek word properly expresses it, apprehendeth not, accepteth not, "the things of the Spirit of God;" or is not qualified for spiritual matters; "for they are foolishness unto him: neither can he know them." Much less is he able to believe the Gospel truly, or to give assent to it, and to regard it as truth. Rom. 8, 7: "The carnal," or the natural man's, "mind is enmity against God: for it is not subject to the law of God, neither indeed can be." And in a word, it will ever remain true, as the Son of God declares, John 15, 5: "Without me ye can do nothing." And Paul adds, Phil. 2, 13: "It is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do of his good pleasure." This cheering declaration is very consolatory to all pious Christians who feel or discover in their hearts a faint spark, or desire for the grace of God and eternal salvation; for they are assured by it that God has enkindled this commencement of true piety in their hearts, and that he will still further strengthen them in their great weakness, and aid them in persevering in the true faith to the end.

Here also we may refer to all the prayers of the saints, in which they entreat God to teach, to enlighten, and to sanctify them, and by which they intimate, that by their own natural powers, they cannot have those things which they entreat God to bestow. Thus, David entreats God, in the 119th Psalm, more than ten times, to impart unto him understanding, so that he may comprehend and learn his divine doctrine rightly; see verses 18, 27, 33, 34, 36, 43, 66, 73, 144, 169. Similar prayers occur in the writings of Paul, Eph. 1, 17, 18; Col. 1, 9; Phil. 1, 9. These prayers and declarations concerning our ignorance and inability, were not written for the purpose of rendering us indolent and remiss in reading, hearing, and meditating on the Word of God; but that we should first of all thank God from our hearts, for liberating us from the darkness of ignorance and the bondage of sin and death, through his Son, and regenerating and enlightening us through Baptism and the Holy Spirit.

And then, after God has made the beginning through his Holy

Spirit in Baptism, and enkindled and wrought both the true knowledge of God and also faith in our hearts, we should entreat him without ceasing, to maintain, to strengthen daily, and unto the end preserve faith in us and his heavenly gifts through the same Spirit and through his grace, by the daily reading and practical application of the Word of God. For unless God himself discharges the office of our teacher, we can study and learn nothing that is acceptable to him and salutary to ourselves and others.

In the second place, the Word of God testifies, that in divine things, the understanding, heart, and will of the natural, unregenerate man, are not only wholly alienated from God, but adverse to him, inclined to all evil, and perverted. Again, man is not only weak, impotent, without ability, and dead to that which is good, but so miserably perverted, poisoned, and corrupted by original sin, that by nature and character he is altogether evil, stubborn, and inimical to God, actively, eagerly, and energetically engaged in doing every thing that is displeasing and opposed to God. Gen. 8, 21: "The imagination of man's heart is evil from his youth." Jer. 17, 9: "The heart is deceitful above all things, and desperately wicked;" or perverted and full of wretchedness which cannot be fathomed. St. Paul, Rom. 8, 7, thus explains this passage: "The carnal mind is enmity against God." Gal. 5, 17: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and these are contrary the one to the other." Rom. 7, 14: "We know that the law is spiritual: but I am carnal, sold under sin." And immediately afterwards: "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing." "For I delight in the law of God, after the inward man," regenerated, namely, through the Holy Spirit, "but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin," &c., ch. 7, 18, 22, 23.

If then in St. Paul and other regenerate persons, the natural or carnal freewill, even after regeneration, opposes the law of God, much more will it, previous to regeneration, be rebellious and inimical to the law and will of God. Hence it is evident,—as we have more fully shown in the article concerning original sin, to which, for the sake of brevity, we will refer,—that freewill by its own natural powers not only cannot effect, or co-operate in effecting, any thing in respect to conversion, righteousness, and salvation; or obey, or believe, or give assent to the Holy Spirit who offers to man the grace of God and salvation through the Gospel; but in consequence of its connate, evil, perverse nature, it also, in a hostile manner, opposes God and his will, unless it is enlightened and governed by the Spirit of God.

Wherefore, the holy Scriptures compare the heart of unregenerate man to a hard stone, which yields not to the touch, but resists, and to unhewn timber, and to a wild, intractable animal; but they do not teach that man, since the fall, is no longer a rational creature, or that he is converted to God without hearing the divine Word, and meditating upon it; or that he is unable to understand, or voluntarily to do or to omit any thing good or evil in external and civil matters.

For, as Dr. Luther remarks in his Commentary on the ninetyeth Psalm: * “In civil and external things which pertain to our support and physical wants, man is ingenious, rational, and very active; but in spiritual and divine matters, which concern the salvation of the soul, he is like a pillar of salt; like Lot’s wife; yea, like wood and stone; like a dead image, which has no use of the eyes, the mouth, the senses or the heart; since man neither sees nor acknowledges the severe and fierce wrath of God against sin, and against that death which it inflicts; but he ever perseveres in his security, consciously and willingly; and thus he falls into innumerable dangers, and finally incurs eternal death and condemnation. No prayer, no entreaty, no admonition, no warning, no rebuke, can arrest him in his course; indeed, teaching and preaching cannot influence him before he is illuminated, converted, and regenerated through the Holy Spirit; and for such a work of the Spirit, man only was created, not wood or stone. And while God, according to his severe and righteous judgment, has cast the fallen, evil spirits away for ever; yet out of his great mercy alone, he has desired that poor, fallen, human nature should again become fit for, and also obtain conversion, the grace of God, and eternal life, not through its own natural and efficient fitness, ability, or capacity—for the nature of man is obstinately opposed to God—but from grace alone, through the merciful and efficacious operation of the Holy Spirit.” And this, Dr. Luther calls *capacity*, (not active, but passive,) which he thus explains: *Quando Patres liberum arbitrium defendunt, capacitatem libertatis ejus prædicant, quod scilicet verti potest ad bonum per gratiam Dei, et fieri revera liberum, ad quod creatum est.* That is:—When the Fathers defend freewill, they speak of it, as being capable of liberty, in such a manner, that through the grace of God, it can be converted to that which is good, and become truly free, for which it was created in the beginning, vol. 1, page 236, [ed. Jen.] Similar re-

* See also Luther’s Commentary on Hosea, chap. 6; also the “*Kirchenpostill über die Epistel am Christtag*,” Tit. 3; and, further, the Gospel appointed for the third Sunday after Epiphany.

marks occur in the work of Augustine, *Contra Julianum*, lib. 2. [c. 8, t. 10, f. 540, edit. Paris.]

But before man is enlightened, converted, regenerated, renewed, and drawn by the Holy Spirit, he can of himself, and by his own natural powers, as little begin, work or co-operate, in spiritual matters, and in his own conversion or regeneration, as a stone, a block, or a clod. For, although he can control his bodily members, and hear the Gospel, and meditate on it in some measure, and speak of it too—as we can observe the Pharisees and hypocrites doing—still he regards it as foolishness, and cannot believe it; and in this case he is worse than a block, because he is opposed and hostile to the will of God, if the Holy Ghost is not efficacious in him, and does not enkindle and work in him faith, obedience, and other virtues which are pleasing in the sight of God.

For, *in the third place*, the Holy Scriptures ascribe man's conversion, faith in Christ, regeneration, renovation, and all that pertains to the actual commencement and accomplishment of these, not to the human powers of the natural freewill, either as to the whole, or the half, or the least or most insignificant part; but *in solidum*, that is, wholly and entirely to the divine operation and the Holy Spirit alone, as the Apology also testifies.

Our reason and freewill possess in some measure the ability to produce an outwardly honest life, but the new birth, the inward change of the heart, mind, and disposition, are works of the Holy Spirit alone. The Holy Spirit opens the understanding and the heart, so that they may understand the Scriptures, and attend to the Word, as it is written, Luke 24, 45: "Then opened he their understanding, that they might understand the Scriptures." Again, Acts 16, 14: "A certain woman, named Lydia, heard us: whose heart the Lord opened, that she attended unto the things which were spoken of Paul." "It is God which worketh in you, both to will and to do," Phil. 2, 13, "to give repentance," Acts 5, 31; 2 Tim. 2, 25. "Unto you it is given to believe on him," Phil. 1, 29. "It is the gift of God," Eph. 2, 8. "This is the work of God, that ye believe on him whom he hath sent," John 6, 29. The Lord gives a heart to perceive, and eyes to see, and ears to hear, Deut. 29, 4; Matt. 13, 16. He is a Spirit of regeneration and renewal, Tit. 3, 5, 6. "I will take the stony heart out of their flesh, and will give them a heart of flesh; that they may walk in my statutes," Ezek. 11, 19, 20; ch. 36, 26; Deut. 30, 6; Psalm 51, 10. "We are created in Christ Jesus unto good works," Eph. 2, 10. "If any man be in Christ, he is a new creature," 2 Cor. 5, 17; Gal. 6, 15. And in

a word, "Every good gift, and every perfect gift, is from above, and cometh down from the Father of lights," James 1, 17. "No man can come to me, except the Father draw him," John 6, 44. "Neither knoweth any man the Father, save the Son, and he to whomsoever the Son will reveal him," Matt. 11, 27. "No man can say that Jesus is the Lord, but by the Holy Ghost," 1 Cor. 12, 3. "Without me," says Christ, "ye can do nothing," John 15, 5. "Our sufficiency is of God," 2 Cor. 3, 5. "What hast thou that thou didst not receive? Now, if thou didst receive it, why dost thou glory as if thou hadst not received it?" 1 Cor. 4, 7. Concerning this passage of Scripture particularly, St. Augustine writes, that by it he was induced to renounce his former erroneous opinion, in which he held: (*De Prædest., cap. 3.*) *Gratiam Dei in eo tantum consistere, quod in præconio veritatis Dei voluntas nobis revelaretur; ut autem prædicato nobis Evangelio consentiremus, nostrum esse proprium, et ex nobis esse. Item. Erravi, (inquit,) cum dicerem, nostrum esse credere et velle; Dei autem, dare credentibus et volentibus facultatem operandi.* That is: "I have erred, in having maintained that the grace of God consists alone in God's revealing his will in the preaching of truth; but that to give assent to the preached Gospel, is our own work, and that this lies in our power." Again, he says, "I have erred in asserting that it lies within our power to believe the Gospel, and to will; but that it is the work of God to give those who believe, and those who will, the power of operating."

The doctrine now stated, is founded on the Word of God; and it is in conformity to the Augsburg Confession, and the other publicly approved writings, which we mentioned above, as the following testimonies show.

In the twentieth article, the Confession thus speaks: "Because the Holy Spirit is given through faith, the heart becomes qualified to perform good works. For before this, while it is without the Holy Spirit, it is too weak; besides it is in the power of Satan, who urges frail human nature to many sins." And immediately afterwards: "For without faith, and out of Christ, the nature and ability of man are much too weak to do good works." page 117.

From these words it is manifest, that the Augsburg Confession by no means acknowledges the human will to be free in spiritual matters; but affirms that man is the captive of Satan. How then should he be able, by his own powers, to turn to the Gospel or to Christ?

The Apology teaches thus concerning freewill: "And we also

affirm that the understanding does possess some portion of freewill; for in determining a matter which is presented and rendered apparent to the power of reason, we possess a freewill." And a little afterwards: "The hearts which are without the Holy Ghost, are without the fear of God, without faith, without confidence, do not believe that God hears them, that he forgives them their sins, that he assists them in time of need; for this reason they are ungodly. Now, 'a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit,' Matt. 7, 18; and, 'without faith it is impossible to please God,' Heb. 11, 6; wherefore, even admitting that there may be some ability within us to perform these external duties, we still affirm that the liberty of the will, and the powers of the mind, *accomplish nothing in spiritual matters.*" page 286 and 287. Hence it is easy to perceive that the Apology ascribes no powers to the human will, either to begin any thing good, or to co-operate of itself.

In the Smalcald Articles the following errors concerning freewill, are also rejected: "That man has freedom of will to do good, and to omit evil." And immediately afterwards the following is rejected as an error: "It is not founded in the Scripture, that the Holy Ghost with his grace, is necessarily required to a good work," &c., page 376.

It is further stated in the Smalcald Articles, thus: "And this repentance continues with Christians till death; for it strives with the sins remaining in the flesh, during the whole course of life, as Paul, Rom. 7, 23, testifies, that he struggles with the law of his members; and this he does not by his own strength, but through the gifts of the Holy Spirit, which follow after the remission of sins. These gifts purify and expel the remaining sins daily, and labor to make the person upright, pure, and holy," page 383. These words say nothing in reference to our will; nor do they assert that it effects any thing of itself, even in regenerated persons; but they ascribe all to the gift of the Holy Spirit, which purifies man, and daily renders him more pious and holy; and from this work our own powers are entirely excluded.

In the Larger Catechism of Dr. Luther it is written: "I am a part and a member of these, a participant and co-partner of all the blessings which they have,—brought in and incorporated with them, by the Holy Ghost, through my having heard, and still continuing to hear the Word of God,—which is the first step towards entering into this community. For before we had come to this," to the Christian church, "we were entirely the subjects of Satan, as those who knew nothing of God and Christ. Thus until the

last day, the Holy Ghost will remain with this holy community or Christian church, through which he persuades us, and which he uses for the purpose of promulgating and exercising the Word; by which he effects sanctification, extending the church, so that it daily increases, and becomes stronger in faith and the fruits which he produces," page 497. In this passage the Catechism makes no reference whatever to our freewill or co-operation; but it attributes all to the Holy Spirit; who introduces us into the Christian church, through the ministry of the Word, sanctifies us in it, and causes us to increase daily in faith and good works.

And although the regenerate arrive at a state in which they will or desire that which is good, and delight in it, and increase in it; yet this result, as we have stated above, does not proceed from our will and our ability, but the Holy Spirit, as Paul himself says in this respect, worketh this *willing* and *doing*, Phil. 2, 13. So also in Eph. 2, 10, he ascribes this work to God alone, when he says: "We are his workmanship, created in Christ Jesus unto good works, which God hath before ordained that we should walk in them."

In the Smaller Catechism of Dr. Luther, it is thus written: "I believe, that I cannot by my own reason or strength believe in, or come to Jesus Christ my Lord; but that the Holy Ghost has called me by the Gospel, enlightened me through his gifts, sanctified and preserved me in the true faith, even as he calls, assembles, and sanctifies the whole Christian church on earth, and preserves it in Christ in the only true faith," page 418.

In the explanation of the Lord's Prayer, in the second petition, we find these words: "How does this come to pass, namely, that the kingdom of God comes to us? Ans.—When our heavenly Father grants us his Holy Spirit, so that we through his grace believe his blessed Word, and live a godly life," page 419.

These testimonies declare, that by our own strength we are unable to come to Christ, but that we need God's gift of his Holy Spirit, by whom we are enlightened and sanctified, and thus through faith brought to Christ, and preserved in him. And here neither our will nor our co-operation is mentioned.

And besides these, we shall transcribe a passage in which Dr. Luther, at a subsequent period, solemnly declares, in his "Larger Confession" concerning the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, that he intends to persevere in this doctrine to the end of his life, in these words: "Hereby I reject and condemn as erroneous, all the doctrines which extol our freewill; as they are directly opposed

to the aid and grace of our Savior Jesus Christ. For since, when we are out of Christ, death and sin are our lords, and Satan is our prince and our god, there can here be no power nor strength, no wisdom nor understanding, by which we can prepare ourselves for righteousness and life, or search after them; but we are blind and captive, the servants of sin and Satan, doing and thinking that which pleases him, and which is opposed to God and his commandments."

In these words Dr. Luther, of blessed memory, ascribes no ability of its own to our freewill, to prepare itself for righteousness, or to search after it, but says that man is blinded and in bondage, doing only the will of Satan, and that which is displeasing to the Lord God. Wherefore, here there can be no co-operation of our will in the conversion of man; but man must be drawn, and born anew of God; otherwise there is no thought in our hearts, which might of itself incline to the reception of the holy Gospel. Thus too Dr. Luther wrote against Erasmus, concerning this matter, in his work *De Servo Arbitrio*, that is, Concerning the Will of man in bondage, and thoroughly explained and proved this point. And afterwards, in his admirable Commentary on the book of Genesis, and especially on the twenty-sixth chapter, he repeats and explains the same doctrine. He there also establishes, in the happiest and most accurate manner, his own meaning and judgment respecting certain collateral questions introduced by Erasmus; for instance, concerning *absolute necessity*, &c., and guards against all misapprehension or error; to all which we here refer as adopted by ourselves.

Wherefore the doctrine is erroneous, according to which it is pretended, that even unregenerate man still has so much ability as to desire to embrace the Gospel, and comfort himself by it; and that thus the natural will of man co-operates in some measure in his conversion. For this false opinion is contrary to the Holy Scriptures, to the Christian Augsburg Confession, to the Apology, to the Smalcald Articles, to the Larger and Smaller Catechisms of Luther, and to other writings of this most eminent and enlightened theologian.

This doctrine, however, concerning the impotence and depravity of our natural freewill, and the doctrine that our conversion and regeneration are the work of God alone, and not of our own powers, are abused in an unchristian manner, both by enthusiasts and by the dissolute; and, in consequence of their language, many persons become loose and vile, indolent and remiss in all Christian exercises, in prayer, reading, and pious meditation—while they say: "Since we are unable, by our own natural powers, to convert our-

selves to God, we will altogether resist him," or they wait till he converts them, forcibly, against their will; or, because they can do nothing in these spiritual matters, but all is the work of the Holy Spirit, they determine to regard neither the Word nor the Sacraments, and neither to hear, nor read, but to wait till God from heaven shall infuse into them his gifts without means, so that they can really feel and perceive in themselves that God has converted them.

Others, who are fainthearted, and who do not understand the doctrine concerning freewill, might perhaps be distressed by painful thoughts and doubts; as, whether God has chosen them, and whether he will work in them also those gifts through the Holy Spirit; especially when they find no strong and ardent faith, no prompt obedience in their hearts, but mere infirmity, anxiety, and misery.

In view of these circumstances, we shall now show further, from the Word of God, how man is converted to God, how and through what means, (namely, through the vocal Word and the holy Sacraments,) the Holy Spirit is efficacious in us; and will work and produce in our hearts true repentance, faith, and new spiritual strength and ability to do good, and how we should conduct ourselves with regard to these means, and how we should use them.

It is not the will of God that any one should perish, (2 Pet. 3, 9,) but that all men should turn unto him, and be saved eternally. "As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked; but that the wicked turn from his way and live," Ezek. 33, 11. "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son, that whosoever believeth in him should not perish, but have everlasting life," John 3, 16.

For this reason God, through his infinite goodness and mercy, causes his divine and eternal law, and his marvellous counsel concerning our redemption, namely, the holy and saving Gospel concerning his eternal Son, our only Savior and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, to be publicly preached. Through this preaching, he gathers for himself an eternal church from among the human race, and works in the hearts of men true repentance, the knowledge of sin, and genuine faith in Jesus Christ, the Son of God. And it is the will of God through these means, and no others, namely, through his holy Word, when it is either preached and heard, or read, and through the use of the sacraments in conformity to his Word, to call men unto everlasting salvation, to draw them unto himself, to convert, regenerate, and sanctify them. "After that, in the wis-

dom of God, the world by wisdom knew not God, it pleased God by the foolishness of preaching to save them that believe," 1 Cor. 1, 21. "Peter shall tell thee what thou oughtest to do," Acts 10, 6. "Faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the word of God," Rom. 10, 17. "Sanctify them," Father, "through thy truth; thy word is truth. Neither pray I for these alone, but for them also which shall believe on me through their word," John 17, 17, 20. Wherefore, the eternal Father proclaims from heaven concerning his beloved Son, and all who preach repentance and the remission of sin in his name: "Hear ye him," Matt. 17, 5.

Now, this preaching all those ought to hear, who desire to be saved. For the preaching of God's Word, and the hearing of it, are the instruments of the Holy Spirit, by, with, and through which he wishes to operate efficaciously, and to convert men unto God, and to work in them both to will and to do.

This word, a man who is even not yet converted to God, and is not regenerated, can hear and read externally. For in these outward things, as we stated above, man possesses, even since the fall, a freewill to some extent, so that he can visit the church, and hear or not hear the preaching.

Through this instrument, namely, the preaching and the hearing of his Word, God works in us, softens our hearts, and draws man, so that, through the preaching of the law, he perceives his sins and the wrath of God, and feels true fear, contrition, and sorrow in his heart. And through preaching and meditation on the holy Gospel, which promises the most gracious remission of sins in Christ, a spark of faith is enkindled in him; he accepts the forgiveness of sins for Christ's sake, and consoles himself with the promise of the Gospel; and thus the Holy Spirit (who works all these things) is "sent forth into the heart." Gal. 4, 6.

Now, although both the planting and the watering by the preacher, and the running and willing by the hearer, would be in vain, and conversion would not follow, if the power and operation of the Holy Spirit were not superadded, who through the Word preached and heard, enlightens and converts the heart, so that men believe that Word, and give their assent to it; nevertheless, neither the preacher nor the hearer should doubt of this grace and operation of the Holy Spirit, but should feel assured, when the Word of God is preached in purity and sincerity according to the command and will of God, and people listen to it with diligence and earnestness, and meditate upon the same, that God is certainly present with his grace, and gives, as stated above, that which man cannot otherwise receive or

give by his own strength. For with respect to the presence, the operations, and the gifts of the Holy Ghost, no one ought, or can always judge *ex sensu*, that is, as to the manner and time in which these things are perceived in the heart; but since these frequently occur, and are concealed under our great imperfections, we should feel assured, agreeably to the promise, that the Word of God, preached and heard, is an office and a work of the Holy Spirit, through which he is certainly efficacious, and works in our hearts, 2 Cor. 2, 14, ch. 3, 5.

If, however, a person should refuse to hear preaching and to read the Word of God, and despise the Word and the church of God, and thus die and perish in his sins, he can neither console himself with the eternal election of God, nor obtain his mercy; for Christ, in whom we are chosen, offers unto all persons his grace in the Word and in the holy Sacraments, and earnestly desires us to hear it; and he has promised, that where two or three are gathered together in his name, and are occupied with his holy Word, there he will be in their midst, Matt. 18, 20.

Now, when such a person despises the means employed by the Holy Spirit, and will not hear, there is no wrong done to him if the Holy Spirit does not enlighten him, but permits him to remain and perish in the darkness of his unbelief; concerning which it is written: "How often would I have gathered thy children together, even as a hen gathereth her chickens under her wings, and ye would not!" Matt. 23, 37.

And in this case, it may be said with truth, that man is not a stone or a block. For a stone or a block does not voluntarily oppose him who moves it,—nor does it understand and perceive what is done to it,—in the manner in which man strives with his will against God, the Lord, until he is converted. And although it is true, that man prior to his conversion, is nevertheless a rational creature, who has an understanding and a will, but not an understanding in divine things, or a will determining him to that which is good and salutary; yet (as stated above) he can do nothing at all towards his conversion, and in this respect he is much worse than a stone or a block; for he strives against the Word and the will of God, until God awakens him from the death of sin, enlightens and renews him.

And although God does not compel man to be converted, (for those who continually resist the Holy Ghost, and persevere in opposing the truth which they have known,—as Stephen speaks concerning the hardened Jews, Acts 7, 51,—are not converted,) yet

the Lord God draws the person whom he converts, and so draws him, that out of a darkened understanding, is created an enlightened understanding, and out of a rebellious will, an obedient will. And this the Scripture calls *creating a new heart*, Psalm 51, 10.

Wherefore it cannot be correctly said, that any *modus agendi*, prior to man's conversion, is possessed by him, that is to say, any mode of doing something good and salutary in divine matters. For since man, previous to his conversion, *is dead in sins*, Eph. 2, 5, there can be no power in him to effect any thing good in spiritual matters, and consequently there can be no *modus agendi*, possessed by him, or any mode or manner of action, in divine things. But when we speak of the mode in which God operates in man, there is a *modus agendi*, or manner in which God operates in man as in a rational creature, and another mode applicable to an irrational creature, or to a stone or a block; there cannot, however, be any *modus agendi*, or mode of effecting any thing good in spiritual matters, ascribed to man before his conversion.

But after a person has been converted, and thus is enlightened, and his will is renewed, he wills that which is good, (so far as he is born anew or is a new creature,) and "delights in the law of God, after the inward man," Rom. 7, 22. And thenceforth as far and as long as he is led by the Spirit of God, so far and so long he will do good; as Paul, Rom. 8, 14, says: "As many as are led by the Spirit of God, they are the sons of God." And this leading of the Holy Spirit is not a *coactio*, or a compulsion, but the converted man does good voluntarily, as David says: "Thy people shall be willing in the day of thy power," Psalm 110, 3. And yet that conflict continues, which St. Paul describes, Rom. 7, 22, 23, 25, even in the regenerated: "I delight in the law of God, after the inward man: but I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin, which is in my members." Again, "So then, with the mind I myself serve the law of God; but with the flesh the law of sin." Again, Gal. 5, 17: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."

Hence it follows, when the Holy Spirit, as already stated, has commenced his work of regeneration and renewal in us, through the Word and the holy Sacraments, that then, assuredly, we can and should co-operate through the power of the Holy Ghost,—although, still, in great weakness. But this co-operation results, not from our natural and carnal powers, but from the new powers and gifts,

which the Holy Spirit originated in us in conversion; and accordingly St. Paul, 2 Cor. 6, 1, expressly and seriously admonishes us, “as workers together with him, not to receive the grace of God in vain.” These words can be understood in no other sense, than that the converted person does good so far and so long as God governs, leads, and directs him with his Holy Spirit; and that if God should withdraw his merciful aid from him, he could not persevere in obedience to God a single moment. If, however, any one should understand that declaration of Paul, as if the converted person co-operates with the Holy Ghost in the same manner as two draught horses draw a carriage, such a degrading sense can in no way be admitted without violence to divine truth.

There is, therefore, a great difference between baptized and unbaptized persons. For since, according to the doctrine of St. Paul, Gal. 3, 27, *all who have been baptized, have put on Christ*, and thus have been truly regenerated, they have *arbitrium liberatum*; that is, as Christ, John 8, 36, says, *are made free*; for this reason, they can, not only hear the Word, but also, with much weakness indeed, assent to, and receive it.

For, since, in this life, we receive only the first fruits of the Spirit, and since regeneration is not perfect, but is only commenced in us, the strife between the flesh and the Spirit continues, even in the elect and the truly regenerate. For we may trace a great difference not only among Christians—one being weak, another strong in spirit;—but every Christian discovers in himself also, that he is at one time joyful in spirit, and at another, timid and fearful; at one time ardent in love, strong in faith and hope, and at another, cold and weak.

But when those who are baptized, act against their conscience, permit sin to rule over them, and thus grieve and lose the Holy Spirit in them, they are not, indeed, to be rebaptized, but they must be re-converted, as has been already sufficiently shown.

For it is certain, that in true conversion, a change or new inclinations and tendencies must occur in the understanding, will, and heart; namely, the heart must acknowledge sin, fear the wrath of God, turn itself away from sin, perceive and accept the promise of grace in Christ, entertain good and spiritual sentiments, and Christian purposes and zeal, and strive against the flesh. For where none of these exist or are displayed, no true conversion can exist. Since, however, the question is concerning the *efficient cause*, that is, who works all this in us, and whence does man derive it, and how does he obtain it? our doctrine shows, that inasmuch as the natural

powers of man can neither do any thing nor contribute towards his conversion, 1 Cor. 2, 14; 2 Cor. 3, 5, therefore God, out of his infinite goodness and mercy, anticipates us, and causes his holy Gospel to be preached, through which the Holy Spirit works and accomplishes this conversion and renewal in us, and through preaching and meditation on his Word, he enkindles in us faith and other acceptable virtues; so that all these are gifts and operations of the Holy Spirit alone. Moreover, this doctrine points out unto us the means through which the Holy Ghost begins and effects in us all that we have mentioned; it also admonishes us respecting the manner in which these gifts are preserved, confirmed, and augmented; and exhorts us not to permit this grace of God to be given in vain, but that we should exercise these gifts diligently, and consider how grievous a sin it is to hinder and resist this operation of the Holy Spirit.

From this complete exposition of the whole doctrine concerning freewill, the questions can finally be decided, concerning which, for a number of years, controversies have been agitated in the churches of the Augsburg Confession; namely, *An homo ante, in, vel post conversionem Spiritui Sancto repugnet, vel pure passive se habeat? an homo convertatur ut truncus? an Spiritus Sanctus detur repugnantibus, et an conversio hominis fiat per modum coactionis?* That is:—Whether man, before, in, or after his conversion, strives against the Holy Spirit, and whether he does nothing at all, but is passive, while God works in him; further, whether in his conversion man is like a block; further, whether the Holy Spirit is given to those who resist him; and lastly, whether conversion takes place through compulsion, so that God compels them by force to be converted against their will. By this exposition, the contrary doctrines and errors can also be recognized, exposed, rebuked, and rejected; as:

1. The irrational doctrine of the Stoics and the Manicheans, that whatever happens, must necessarily so happen, *et hominem coactum omnia facere*; that is, that man performs all that he does, through compulsion, and that the will of man has no freedom or ability even in external operations, so as to exhibit external righteousness and an honest life to some extent, and to avoid outward sins and vices; or, that the will of man is forced towards external evil deeds, lasciviousness, rapine, murder, &c.

2. The gross error of the Pelagians, that freewill is able by its own natural powers, without the Holy Spirit, to convert itself to God, to believe the Gospel, and to be obedient to the law of God

with the whole heart, and through this voluntary obedience, to merit the remission of sins and eternal life.

3. The error of the Papists and the schoolmen who proceeded with more subtlety, and taught that man is able by his own natural powers to begin a virtuous course and his own conversion, and that, since man is too weak to accomplish the good which was begun by his own natural powers, the Holy Spirit comes to his assistance.

4. The doctrine of the Synergists, who pretend that man is not entirely dead to every thing that is good in spiritual things, but that he is seriously wounded, and half dead. Wherefore, although freewill is too feeble to make the beginning, and by its own powers to convert itself to God and to be obedient to the law of God from the heart; yet, when the Holy Spirit shall have made the beginning, and called us through the Gospel, and offered us his grace, the forgiveness of sins, and eternal salvation, that then man's freewill, by its own natural powers, is able to meet God, and to a limited extent, to contribute somewhat, though feebly, towards this reformation, to aid and co-operate, to fit and apply itself to the grace of God, to apprehend and accept the same, and to believe the Gospel, and also by its own powers to co-operate with the Holy Ghost in continuing and maintaining this work.

In opposition, however, to this error, we have shown above, at some length, that this power, namely, *facultas applicandi se ad gratiam*, that is, of naturally adapting ourselves to divine grace, proceeds, not from our own natural powers, but from the operation of the Holy Spirit alone.

5. The doctrine of the popes and monks, that after regeneration, man can fulfil the law of God perfectly in this life; and that through this fulfilment of the law, he is justified before God, and merits eternal life.

6. On the other hand, those enthusiasts are also to be rebuked with the greatest earnestness and zeal, and are by no means to be tolerated in the church of God, who pretend that God draws men to himself, enlightens, justifies, and saves them, without any means, without the hearing of the divine Word, and without the use of the holy Sacraments.

7. The same applies to those who pretend that, in conversion and regeneration, God so creates a new heart and a new man, that the substance and essence of the old Adam, and especially the rational soul, are entirely abolished, and that a new essence of the soul is created out of nothing. This error St. Augustine refutes expressly, in his explanation of the 25th Psalm, where he quotes this declara-

tion of Paul: *Deponite veterem hominem, &c.*; "Put off the old man, &c.," Eph. 4, 22; which he explains in these words: *Ne aliquis arbitretur, deponendam esse aliquam substantiam, exposuit, quid esset, Deponite veterem hominem, et induite novum, cum dicit in consequentibus: Quapropter deponentes mendacium, loquimini veritatem. Ecce, hoc est deponere veterem hominem, et induere novum, etc.* That is:—In order that no one might hold that the substance or essence of man must be put off, he himself has explained what it is to put off the old man, and to put on the new, by saying in the succeeding words: "Wherefore, putting away lying, speak ye the truth." Behold, this is putting off the old man, and putting on the new.

8. And we also reject the following forms of expression, if used without an explanation:—That the will of man, before, in, and after conversion, resists the Holy Spirit, and that the Holy Ghost is given to those who resist him.

For, from the preceding explanation, it is evident, that where, through the Holy Spirit, no change at all takes place into that which is good, in the understanding, the will, and the heart, and man does not at all believe the promises, and is not qualified of God for the reception of grace, but strives wholly and entirely against the Word, no conversion can occur, or can have taken place. For conversion is such a change, through the operation of the Holy Spirit, in the understanding, the will, and the heart of man, that through this operation of the Holy Spirit, he can accept the offered grace. And indeed, all who obstinately and perseveringly strive against the operations and movings of the Holy Spirit, which occur through the Word, receive not the Holy Spirit, but grieve and lose him.

But even in the regenerate there still remains an obstinacy, of which the Scripture makes mention: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit," Gal. 5, 17. Again, "Fleshly lusts which war against the soul," 1 Pet. 2, 11; and, the "law in my members warring against the law of my mind," Rom. 7, 23.

Wherefore, the person who is not regenerated strives wholly against God, and is entirely the servant of sin. The regenerate man, however, delights in the law of God, after the inward man; but he nevertheless perceives in his members the law of sin, which strives against the law of the mind. With the mind, therefore, he serves the law of God, but with the flesh, the law of sin, Rom. 7, 25. In this manner the true doctrine concerning this matter can and must be thoroughly, perspicuously, and judiciously explained and taught.

But with respect to the expressions of Chrysostom and Basil: *Trahit Deus, sed volentem trahit; tantum velis, et Deus præoccurrit*; and those of the schoolmen: *Hominis voluntas in conversione non est otiosa; sed agit aliquid*; that is, “God draws, but he draws him who is willing;” again, “Have the will only, and God will anticipate thee;” moreover, “The will of man is not idle in conversion, but worketh somewhat:” we hold, that as these expressions were introduced for the purpose of establishing the natural freewill in the conversion of man, contrary to the doctrine concerning the grace of God, it is evident from the preceding explanation which we have set forth, that they are not according to the form of sound doctrine, but contrary to it; and consequently, when we speak of conversion to God, they should be justly avoided.

For, the conversion of our depraved will, which is nothing else but a resuscitation of it from spiritual death, is the work of God alone; even as our bodily resurrection when the dead shall rise, is also to be ascribed to God alone; as we have fully explained above, and proved by positive testimonies from the holy Scriptures.

But the manner in which God changes rebellious and unwilling into willing men, through the drawing of the Holy Spirit, and the fact that after this conversion, the regenerate will of man is not unemployed in daily exercise of repentance, but co-operates in all the works of the Holy Spirit, which he performs through us, has been sufficiently explained above.

Thus, too, when Luther says that man is altogether passive in his conversion, that is, does nothing at all in it, but merely suffers that which God works in him, he does not mean that conversion takes place without the preaching and hearing of the divine Word; nor does he mean that in conversion, no new emotion whatever is produced in us, and no spiritual operation is commenced in us, by the Holy Spirit; but he means that man of himself, or by his own natural powers, is unable to effect any thing, or to assist in his conversion, and that this conversion is not only in part, but wholly and entirely an operation, a gift, and a work of the Holy Spirit alone, who by his own power and might, works and accomplishes the same, through the Word, in the understanding, the will, and the heart of man, *tanquam in subjecto patiente*; that is, the person neither doing nor effecting any thing, but merely permitting it to be done; not as a statue hewn out of a stone, nor as a seal impressed on wax, which has neither knowledge, nor perception, nor will, with respect to the act; but in the manner, which has already been defined and explained.

And, since, in the schools, the young have been very much con-

fused by the doctrine : *De tribus causis efficientibus, concurrentibus in conversione hominis non renati*, that is, the doctrine concerning the three efficient causes of the conversion of unregenerate man to God, as far as it relates to the manner in which these (namely, the preached and the heard Word of God, the Holy Spirit, and the will of man,) concur : we yet remark that from the explanation already presented, it is clear that conversion to God is the work of God the Holy Ghost alone, who is the true author, who alone works this in us ; for which purpose he employs the preaching and the hearing of his holy Word, as his ordinary means and instrument. But the understanding and the will of unregenerate man, are nothing else than the *subjectum convertendum*, that is, that which is to be converted, as being the understanding and will of a man spiritually dead, in whom the Holy Spirit works conversion and a renewal. In this conversion the will of man, the subject of conversion, does nothing, but merely suffers God to operate in it, until it is regenerated. And then it also co-operates with the Holy Spirit in other subsequent good works, doing that which is pleasing to God, in the manner which has been abundantly explained above.

III. OF JUSTIFICATION BY FAITH.

The third controversy, which has arisen among some theologians of the Augsburg Confession, relates to the righteousness of Christ or of faith, which faith God, through his grace, imputes unto miserable sinners, for righteousness.

For one party contended that the righteousness of faith, which the Apostle, Rom. 3, 21, 22, calls the righteousness of God, is the essential righteousness of God, which is Christ himself as the true, natural, and essential Son of God, who through faith dwells in the elect, impels them to the performance of that which is good, and thus is their righteousness ; in comparison with which righteousness, the sins of all men are as a drop of water in the great sea.

On the other hand, some have maintained and taught, that Christ is our righteousness according to his human nature alone.

In opposition to both of these parties, the other teachers of the Augsburg Confession unanimously taught, that Christ is our righteousness, not according to his divine nature alone, nor yet according to his human nature alone, but according to both natures ; who, as God and man, by his perfect obedience, has redeemed us from our sins, has justified and saved us ; so that the righteousness of faith is the remission

of sins, reconciliation with God, and our adoption as children of God, for the sake of the obedience of Christ alone, which obedience is imputed for righteousness, through faith only, by grace alone, unto all true believers ; and thus, in consequence of it, they are absolved from all their unrighteousness.

Besides this controversy, other debates concerning the article of justification, were occasioned by the *Interim* as well as by other causes. These we shall afterwards explain antithetically ; that is, by a recitation of those errors which are opposed to the pure doctrine of this article.

This article concerning justification by faith is, as the Apology declares, the leading article of the whole Christian doctrine ; without which a disturbed conscience can have no sure consolation, or rightly conceive the riches of the grace of Christ ; as Dr. Luther has written : “ If this single article remain pure, the whole Christian community will also remain pure and harmonious, and without any factions ; but if it remain not pure, it is impossible to resist any error or fanatical spirit.” Vol. V. page 159, edit. Jen. Lat. Vol. III. page 397. And with respect to this article in particular, Paul, 1 Cor. 5, 6 ; Gal. 5, 9, says : “ A little leaven leaveneth the whole lump.” For that reason he enforces in this article, with so much earnestness and zeal, the *particulæ exclusivæ*,—namely, the words, “ without law,” “ without works,” “ by grace,” (Rom. 3, 28 ; 4, 5 ; Eph. 2, 8, 9,) by which the works of man are excluded,—for the purpose of showing how highly necessary it is, in this article, not only to unfold the true doctrine, but also to set forth the contrary doctrines, that they may be discriminated, exposed, and rejected.

For the purpose, therefore, of explaining this controversy in a Christian manner, according to the analogy of the Word of God, and of deciding it by his grace, our doctrine, faith, and confession, we declare to be the following :

Concerning the righteousness of faith before God, we believe, teach, and confess unanimously, according to the preceding summary of our Christian faith and confession, that poor sinful man is justified before God—that is, absolved and declared free from all his sins, and from the sentence of his well-deserved condemnation, and is adopted as a child and an heir of eternal life—without any human merit or worthiness, and without any antecedent, present, or subsequent works, out of pure grace, for the sake of the merit, the perfect obedience, the bitter sufferings and death, and the resurrection of Christ our Lord alone ; whose obedience is imputed unto us for righteousness.

These blessings are offered unto us through the Holy Spirit, in the

promises of the Gospel ; and faith is the only medium through which we apprehend and receive them, and apply and appropriate them to ourselves. This faith is a gift of God, through which we rightly acknowledge Christ, our Redeemer, in the Word of the Gospel, and confide in him, that, namely, for the sake of *his* obedience alone, we have forgiveness of sins through grace, are reputed of God the Father as righteous and just, and are eternally saved. Accordingly, these propositions are equivalent, and regarded as one and the same, when Paul, Rom. 3, 28, says: "That a man is justified by faith;" or, Rom. 4, 5, that "faith is counted" unto us "for righteousness;" and when he says, that "by the obedience of one" mediator, Christ, "shall many be made righteous;" or, that "by the righteousness of one, the free gift came upon all men, unto justification of life," Rom. 5, 18, 19. For faith justifies us, not because it is a work of great value and an eminent virtue, but because it apprehends and receives the merit of Christ in the promise of the holy Gospel ; for this merit must be applied and appropriated unto ourselves through faith, if we shall be justified by it. Hence that righteousness, which is imputed to faith, or to believers, before God, through grace alone, is the obedience, the sufferings, and the resurrection of Christ, by which he has rendered complete satisfaction unto the law for us, and made expiation for our sins. For, since Christ is not only man, but God and man in one undivided person, he was as little subject to the law, being Lord of the law, as it would have been necessary for him to suffer and die for his own person. His obedience, therefore, not only in suffering and dying, but in his being voluntarily put under the law in our stead, and fulfilling it with such obedience, is imputed unto us for righteousness ; so that, for the sake of this perfect obedience, which he rendered unto his heavenly Father for us, in both doing and suffering, in his life and death, God forgives us our sins, accounts us as righteous and just, and saves us eternally. This righteousness is offered unto us through the Gospel and in the Sacraments, by the Holy Spirit ; and through faith it is applied, appropriated, and embraced ; hence believers derive reconciliation with God, remission of sins, the grace of God, adoption as children, and the inheritance of eternal life.

Accordingly, the word to *justify* here signifies to declare just and absolved from sins, and to account as released from the eternal punishment of sins, for the sake of the righteousness of Christ, which is imputed by God to faith, Phil. 3, 9. And this usage or import of that word, is common in the holy Scriptures of the Old and New Testaments. Prov. 17, 15: "He that justifieth the wicked, and he that condemneth the just, even they both are abomination to the Lord."

Isa. 5, 23: "Which justify the wicked for reward," &c. Rom. 8, 33: "Who shall lay any thing to the charge of God's elect? It is God that justifieth;" that is, absolves and declares free from sins.

But since the word *regeneration* is sometimes used for the word *justification*, it is necessary to explain the former with precision, in order that the renewal, which follows justification by faith, may not be confounded with justification by faith, but be properly distinguished from it.

For, in the first place, the word *regeneration* is used in such a sense as to comprehend the forgiveness of sins for the sake of Christ alone, as well as the subsequent renewal which the Holy Ghost works in those who are justified by faith. But then it is also employed to signify only the remission of sins, and adoption among the children of God. And in this latter sense this word is frequently used in the Apology, as where it is written, that justification is regeneration. Thus too, St. Paul makes a distinction between these words, Tit. 3, 5: "He saved us, by the washing of regeneration, and renewing of the Holy Ghost." So also the word *vivification* is sometimes used in a similar sense. For if a person is justified through faith, (which the Holy Spirit alone works,) it is truly a regeneration, because from a child of wrath, he is made a child of God, and is thus transferred from death unto life, as it is written: "When we were dead in sins God hath quickened us together with Christ," Eph. 2, 5. Again, "The just shall live by faith," Rom. 1, 17; Habak. 2, 4. In this sense, the word *regeneration* is frequently employed in the Apology.

But, further, the word *regeneration* is also frequently used to imply the sanctification and renewal which follow justification by faith, in which signification Dr. Luther has used it in his work concerning the Church and Councils, and elsewhere in his writings.

When however we teach, that we are born anew and justified through the operation of the Holy Spirit, it must not be understood, as if no unrighteousness whatever adhered to the justified and regenerate, in their essence or in their conduct after regeneration; but that Christ with his perfect obedience covers all their sins, which still adhere to nature in this life. Notwithstanding this, they are pronounced and accounted righteous and just through faith, for the sake of that righteousness of Christ which he rendered unto the Father for us, from his birth to his most ignominious death on the cross, although they still are and remain sinners, even unto their death, in consequence of their corrupt nature. Nor do we, on the other hand, mean that we are allowed, or that we should commit sins, and persevere and remain in them, without repentance, conversion, and amendment of life.

For true contrition precedes justification. And to those, as we stated above, who are justified before God, that is, received into his grace, for the sake of Christ, the only Mediator, out of pure grace, through faith alone, without any of their works and merit, the Holy Spirit is also given, who renews and sanctifies them, and works in them love towards God and towards their neighbors. But as their renewal is only commenced and remains imperfect in this life, and as sin still dwells in the flesh, even of the regenerate, righteousness of faith before God consists in a gracious imputation of the righteousness of Christ, without the addition of our works; so that our sins are forgiven, covered over, and not imputed to us, Rom. 4, 6, 7, 8.

But, if we wish to retain in its purity the article concerning justification, great diligence and care are to be observed, lest that which precedes faith, and that which follows it, be at the same time intermingled and introduced into the article concerning justification, as necessary and pertaining to it. For it is not one and the same thing to speak of conversion and of justification.

For, not all that is requisite to conversion pertains at the same time to the article of justification. For to justification these alone belong and are necessary: the grace of God, the merit of Christ, and faith which accepts these in the promise of the Gospel, and thus the righteousness of Christ is imputed unto us; whence we obtain and have remission of sins, reconciliation with God, the adoption, and the inheritance of eternal life.

A true and saving faith therefore does not dwell in those who entertain no contrition and sorrow, and who have the evil design to remain in sin, and to persevere in it. But true contrition precedes, and genuine faith attends true repentance.

Love is also a fruit which certainly and necessarily follows after faith. For if a person love not, it is a sure indication that he is not justified, but that he abideth in death, or that he has again lost the righteousness of faith, as John, (1 John 3, 14,) testifies. But when Paul, (Rom. 3, 24, 28,) affirms, that we are justified by faith without the deeds of the law, he indicates by these words, that neither antecedent contrition, nor subsequent works, pertain to the article or subject of justification by faith. For good works do not precede justification, but follow it, and the individual must first be justified, before he can perform good works.

Likewise, although the renewal and sanctification of man are a benefit conferred by the Mediator, Christ, and a work of the Holy Spirit, yet they do not pertain to the article or subject of justification before God, but they follow after it, since, on account of the corrup-

tion of our flesh, they are not entirely pure and perfect in this life, as, in respect to this matter, Dr. Luther has satisfactorily described the whole in his excellent and extensive Commentary on the Epistle to the Galatians, in which he thus speaks: "We readily concede, that we should teach concerning love and good works too, yet so that it be done at a proper time and in a proper place; namely, when we are engaged in discoursing of works, independently of this subject of justification. But here the principal matter with which we are occupied, is the inquiry, not whether we should also love and perform good works, but by what means we may be justified before God, and be saved. We answer therefore with St. Paul, that we are justified through faith in Christ alone, and not through the works of the law, or through love; not that we hereby reject works and love, as our adversaries falsely charge us, but in order that we may not permit ourselves to be led away, as Satan earnestly desires, from the principal subject with which we are here engaged, to another extraneous matter, which does not at all pertain to this subject. Consequently, while we are occupied with this article concerning justification, we reject and condemn works, since this article is of such a nature as not to admit of any disputation, or controversy concerning works; and for this reason we set aside in this case all laws, and all the works of the law." Thus far Dr. Luther.—[Vol. IV. 46. Ed. Jen.]

Wherefore, in order that the distressed heart may find sure and lasting consolation, and that due honor may be given to the merit of Christ and to the grace of God, the Scripture teaches that the righteousness of faith before God, consists alone in the gracious reconciliation, or remission of sins, which is given unto us out of pure grace, for the merit of the Mediator Christ alone, and which is received through faith in the promise of the Gospel. Thus too this faith, in the case of justification before God, relies neither on contrition, nor on love, nor on other virtues, but on Christ alone; depending upon that perfect obedience with which he fulfilled the law for us, and which is imputed unto believers for righteousness.

Neither contrition, nor love, nor any other virtue, but faith alone is the medium and instrument, by and through which we can receive and embrace the grace of God, the merit of Christ, and the remission of sins; which blessings are offered unto us in the promise of the Gospel.

It is likewise rightly asserted that believers who have been justified by faith in Christ, in this life have first the imputed righteousness of faith, and afterwards the incipient righteousness of new obedience, or of good works. But these two must not be confounded, or

be at the same time introduced into the article of justification by faith before God. For, since this incipient righteousness, or renewal in us, is imperfect and impure in this life in consequence of the flesh, the individual, on account of that righteousness, cannot stand acquitted before the judgment-seat of God ; but the righteousness alone of the obedience, the sufferings, and the death of Christ, which is imputed to faith, can stand before the judgment-seat of God ; for the sake, therefore, of that obedience alone, the individual, even after his renewal, (though he may have performed many good works, and may lead the best life,) pleases God, becomes acceptable, and is received as a child and an heir of eternal life.

And to this is to be referred the declaration of St. Paul, who writes, (Rom. 4, 3,) that Abraham was justified before God by faith alone on account of the Mediator, without the addition of his works, not only when he had been first converted from idolatry, and had no good works, but also when he had been renewed through the Holy Spirit, and adorned with many glorious and good works, Gen. 15, 6 ; Heb. 11, 8. And Paul, Rom. 4, 3, propounds this question : On what was the righteousness of Abraham before God founded, through which he had a gracious God, and was pleasing and acceptable to him, and became an heir of eternal life ?

To which he answers : “ To him that worketh not, but believeth on him that justifieth the ungodly, his faith is counted for righteousness. Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works,” Rom. 4, 5, 6. Wherefore, even if converted persons and believers have an incipient renewal, sanctification, love, virtue, and good works, yet these cannot and must not be drawn into, or intermingled in the article of justification before God ; so that the honor of Christ the Redeemer may remain, and that, since our new obedience is imperfect and impure, disturbed consciences may have a sure consolation.

And this is the intention of the apostle Paul, when he urges with such care and diligence in this article the *particulæ exclusivæ*, namely, the words by which works are excluded from the article of righteousness by faith ; for instance, *absque operibus, sine lege, gratis, non ex operibus* ; that is, *by grace, without merit, without law, without works, not of works*, all which are comprehended in these words : “ By faith alone we are justified before God and saved.” For thus works are excluded, not however in such a sense as if true faith could exist without contrition, or, as if good works should not, must not, or need not, follow true faith, as certain and indubitable fruits ; or, as if believers neither need nor ought to perform

any thing good; but from the article of justification before God, good works are excluded, so that in the justification of a poor sinner before God, they may not be introduced, interwoven, or intermingled as necessary or belonging to it. And the following statement exhibits the true sense of the *particulæ exclusivæ*,—of the words mentioned above in the article of justification; which sense should, with all diligence and assiduity, be retained and urged in this article:

1. That by these *particulæ*, or words, all works of our own, our merit, worthiness, glory, and confidence in any of our own works, are wholly and entirely excluded in the article of justification; so that our works may not be proposed and held either as causing or meriting justification, which God should regard in this case, or upon which we might or should depend, either as to the whole, or even the least portion thereof.

2. That this remains the office and property of faith alone, that it alone, and nothing else, is the medium or instrument, by and through which the grace of God and the merit of Christ, in the promise of the Gospel, are apprehended, received, and accepted, and are applied and appropriated to us; and that love and all other virtues, or works, are excluded from this office and property of such application or appropriation.

3. That neither renewal, nor sanctification, nor virtues, nor good works, can be *tanquam forma, aut causa justificationis*, that is, can be either our righteousness before God, or be considered or established as a part or a cause of our righteousness, or be intermingled in the article of justification as necessary and requisite to it, under any pretext, name, or title; but that the righteousness of faith consists in the remission of sins alone, out of pure grace, for the sake of the merit of Christ alone. These blessings are offered unto us in the promise of the Gospel; and through faith alone they are received and accepted, applied and appropriated unto us.

In this manner the proper order of faith and good works, as well as of justification and renewal, or sanctification, is to be observed.

For good works do not precede faith, nor does sanctification precede justification. But faith is first enkindled in us by the Holy Spirit in conversion, through the hearing of the Gospel. This faith apprehends the grace of God in Christ, through which the individual is justified. Afterwards, when the individual is justified, he is also renewed and sanctified by the Holy Spirit. And after such renewal and sanctification the fruits or good works follow. *Et hæc non ita divelluntur, quasi vera fides aliquando et aliquandiu stare possit*

cum malo proposito, sed ordine causarum et effectuum, antecedentium et consequentium, ita distribuuntur; manet enim, quod Lutherus recte dicit: Bene conveniunt et sunt connexa inseparabiliter, fides et opera; sed sola fides est, quæ apprehendit benedictionem sine operibus, et tamen nunquam est sola. That is:—This is not to be understood as if justification and renewal are separated from each other, so that true faith can sometimes exist in connection with an evil design for a season: but here the order alone is exhibited, according to which, the one precedes or succeeds the other. For it is invariably true, as Dr. Luther has rightly said [Vol. IV. *Op. Jen.* Lat. f. 89, vol. II. *Comm. in Gen.* 22, f. 57,]: “Faith and good works accord and suit excellently together; but it is faith alone that apprehends the blessing, without works. And yet it is at no time alone,”—as we have already sufficiently shown.

Now, many disputed points may be usefully and properly explained by this true distinction, which the Apology offers when it speaks of the declaration of James, (James 2, 20, 24.) For when we describe how faith justifies, the doctrine of St. Paul is, that faith alone justifies without works, since, as we have said, it applies and appropriates unto us the merit of Christ. If, however, it be asked, “Wherein and whereby can a Christian distinguish, either in himself, or in others, a true and living faith from a pretended and dead faith, since many torpid and secure Christians entertain false opinions concerning their faith, when at the same time they have no true faith?” the Apology thus replies to it: “James calls faith dead, which does not produce all manner of good works and fruits of the Spirit,” page 200. And in this sense the Latin Apology asserts: *Jacobus recte negat, nos tali fide justificari, quæ est sine operibus, hoc est, quæ mortua est.* That is, St. James teaches rightly, when he denies that we are justified by a faith which is without works, for it is a dead faith.

But James speaks, as the Apology declares, concerning the works of those who have already been justified through Christ, who have been reconciled to God, and have obtained the forgiveness of sins through Christ. If, however, it be asked, “How can faith justify and save, and what means are requisite when it produces that result?” then it is false and wrong to assert: *Fidem non posse justificare sine operibus: vel Fidem, quatenus caritatem, qua formetur, conjunctam habet, justificare: vel Fidei, ut justificet, necessariam esse præsentiam bonorum operum; aut ad justificationem, vel in articulo justificationis esse necessariam præsentiam bonorum operum: vel bona opera esse causam sine qua non, quæ per particulas exclu-*

sivas ex articulo Justificationis non excludantur. That is, that faith cannot justify without works; or, that faith thus justifies or renders righteous, because it is accompanied by love, on account of which this effect is ascribed to faith; or, that the presence of good works with faith is necessary, if the individual is to be justified by it before God; or, that the presence of good works is necessary in the article of justification, or essential to justification; so that good works are to be regarded as a cause, without which the individual cannot be justified, and that they are not excluded from the article of justification, by the *particulæ exclusivæ, absque operibus, etc.*; that is, when St. Paul, Eph. 2, 9, says: *Not of works.* For faith justifies, for the reason and from the circumstance alone, that it apprehends and accepts the grace of God and the merit of Christ in the promise of the Gospel, as a means and an instrument.

And let this suffice, on the present occasion, as a compendious explanation of the doctrine concerning justification by faith, which doctrine is more copiously treated in the writings named above. From what we have now stated also, it is evident that not only those errors which we have mentioned above, but that the following false doctrines which are opposed to the explanation now given, must also be refuted, exposed, and rejected, namely:

1. That our love or our good works, either wholly or in part, merit or are the cause of our justification before God.

2. Or, that by his good works, man must prepare himself and become worthy, so that the merits of Christ may be imparted unto him.

3. *Vel formalem nostram justitiam coram Deo esse inherentem nostram novitatem, seu caritatem*; that is, that our true righteousness before God is love, or the renewal which the Holy Spirit works in us, and which is in us.

4. Or, that two things or parts pertain to the righteousness of faith before God; namely, the gracious remission of sins, and our renewal or sanctification.

5. *Item fidem justificare tantum initialiter, vel partialiter, vel principaliter, et novitatem vel caritatem nostram justificare etiam coram Deo, vel complete, vel minus principaliter.*

6. *Item, Credentes coram Deo justificari, vel coram Deo justos esse, simul et imputatione et inchoatione: vel partim imputatione, partim inchoatione novæ obedientiæ.*

7. *Item, Applicationem promissionis gratiæ fieri, et fide cordis, et confessione oris ac reliquis virtutibus.* That is, that faith justifies only because righteousness is commenced in us through faith; or thus, that faith has the preference in justification, but that never-

theless our renewal and love pertain to our righteousness before God, yet in such a manner that they are not the principal cause of our righteousness, but that without this love and renewal our righteousness before God would not be complete or perfect. Again, that believers are justified before God and righteous, at the same time through the imputed righteousness of Christ, and through the incipient new obedience, or partly through the imputation of the righteousness of Christ, and partly through the incipient new obedience. Again, that the promise of grace is appropriated to us through faith in the heart, and through the confession which is made with the lips, and through other virtues.

The doctrine is likewise erroneous, according to which man must be saved in another manner, or by something else than that by which he is justified before God, so that we are indeed justified by faith alone, without works, but to be saved without works, or to obtain salvation without works, is impossible.

This doctrine is false, because it is diametrically opposed to the declaration of Paul, Rom. 4, 6: "Even as David also describeth the blessedness of the man unto whom God imputeth righteousness without works." And this is the foundation of Paul's argument, Tit. 3, 5-7, that in the same manner as righteousness is obtained, so do we also obtain salvation; yea, that even by our justification by faith, we also at the same time receive the adoption, the inheritance of eternal life, and salvation. And for this reason Paul introduces and urges the *particulæ exclusivæ*, that is, the words by which works and merit of our own, are entirely excluded, namely, *by grace, without works*, as peremptorily in the article of salvation, as he does in the article of justification.

In like manner too, the disputed point concerning the indwelling of the essential righteousness of God in us, must be rightly explained. For although God,—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, the eternal and essential righteousness,—dwells, through their faith, in the elect who are justified through Christ, and who are reconciled to God; (for all Christians are temples of God,—the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost,—who urges them forward to the performance of that which is right;) yet this indwelling of God is not that righteousness of faith, concerning which St. Paul speaks, and which he calls *justitia Dei*, that is, the righteousness of God, on account of which we are pronounced just before God. But this indwelling of God follows after the antecedent righteousness of faith, which is nothing else but the remission of sins and the gracious reception of poor sinners, for the sake of the obedience and merit of Christ alone.

Accordingly, since in our churches it is admitted by the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, that all our righteousness must be sought apart from the merits, works, virtues, and worthiness of ourselves and of all other men, and that it consists in Christ the Lord alone, we are to consider carefully in what manner Christ is called our righteousness in the article of justification; namely, that our righteousness consists, not in the one nor in the other [human or divine] nature, but in the whole person of Christ; who as God and man in his sole, entire and perfect obedience is our righteousness.

For, although Christ was conceived of the Holy Ghost, and was born without sin, and although he had fulfilled all righteousness in his human nature only, yet if he had not been true, eternal God, this obedience and suffering of the human nature could not have been imputed unto us for righteousness: so also, if the Son of God had not become man, the divine nature alone could not have been our righteousness. Accordingly, we believe, teach, and confess, that the entire obedience of the whole person of Christ, which he rendered unto the Father for us, even unto his most ignominious death on the cross, is imputed unto us for righteousness. For his human nature alone, without the divine, could not have made satisfaction unto the eternal, Almighty God, for the sins of the whole world, either by obedience or suffering, and his divinity alone, without his humanity, could not have mediated between God and man.

Since, however, as we have stated above, it is the obedience of the whole person, it is also a perfect satisfaction and expiation for the human race, by which satisfaction was made unto the eternal, immutable justice of God, which is revealed in the law. And this obedience is our righteousness which avails in the sight of God, which is revealed unto us in the Gospel, upon which our faith rests before God, and which he imputes to faith, as it is written, Rom. 5, 19: "For as by one man's disobedience many were made sinners; so by the obedience of one shall many be made righteous." And 1 John 1, 7: "The blood of Jesus Christ, his Son, cleanseth us from all sin." Again, Rom. 1, 17; Habak. 2, 4: "The just shall live by faith."

In this manner neither the divine nor the human nature of Christ by itself is imputed unto us for righteousness, but the obedience of the person alone, who is at the same time God and man. And thus, faith looks upon the person of Christ, as the same was made under the law for us, bore our sins, and when proceeding to the Father, rendered entire and perfect obedience to his heavenly Father, for us poor sinners, from his holy birth unto his death; and thereby cover-

ed all our disobedience, which inheres in our nature, in its thoughts, words, and deeds ; so that it is no more imputed to us unto condemnation, but is pardoned and remitted through pure grace, for the sake of Christ alone.

Therefore, besides the errors stated above, we reject and condemn unanimously the following and all similar errors, as repugnant to the Word of God, to the doctrine of the Prophets and Apostles, and to our Christian faith :

1. When it is taught, that Christ is our righteousness before God according to his divine nature alone.

2. That Christ is our righteousness according to the human nature alone.

3. That in the declarations of the Prophets and Apostles, in which the righteousness of faith is spoken of, the words *to justify* and *to be justified*, should not be made to signify, to declare or to be declared free from sin, and to obtain forgiveness of sins ; but in truth and reality to be made righteous, in consequence of the love and virtue infused by the Holy Spirit, and the works following from them.

4. That faith regards not only the obedience of Christ, but his divine nature also, so far as the same dwells and works in us, and that through such indwelling, our sins may be covered before God.

5. That faith is such a reliance on the obedience of Christ, as may be and remain in an individual who does not feel any genuine repentance, and in whom no love exists, but who, contrary to the dictates of conscience, persists in sin.

6. That not God, but only the gifts of God dwell in the believing heart.

These and all similar errors we reject unanimously, as repugnant to the express Word of God ; and by the grace of God we constantly and steadily persevere in the doctrine concerning the righteousness of faith before God, as it is stated, explained, and demonstrated by the Word of God, in the Augsburg Confession and its Apology.

For any further explanations which may be required in reference to this high and most important article of our justification before God, upon which the salvation of our souls depends, we shall for the sake of brevity, refer all to the distinguished and excellent Commentary of Dr. Luther on the Epistle of St. Paul to the Galatians.

IV. OF GOOD WORKS.

Among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession a dissension also arose concerning good works : the one party used the following words and expressions :— Good works are necessary to salva-

tion: it is impossible to be saved without good works: no one has ever been saved without good works, since good works are required of true believers as fruits of faith, and faith without love is dead, although this love be no cause of salvation.

The other party, on the contrary, contended that good works are indeed necessary, not to salvation however, but for other reasons; and that therefore the preceding propositions or expressions, (since they are inconsistent with the form of sound words and doctrine, and have always been and are still used by the Papists in opposition to the doctrine of our Christian faith, according to which we confess that faith alone justifies and saves,) are not to be tolerated in the church, in order that the merits of Christ our Savior may not be disparaged, and that the promise of salvation may remain firm and sure to believers.

In this controversy a few persons employed a disputable proposition, namely, that good works are pernicious to salvation. It was also contended by some that good works are not *necessary*, but voluntary, since they should not be extorted by the dread and the denunciations of the law, but should flow from a willing mind, and a joyful heart. On the contrary, the other party contended that good works are necessary.

This controversy originated from the words *necessitas* and *libertas*, that is, *necessity* and *liberty*, since the word *necessitas*, especially, signifies not only the eternal, immutable order, according to which, all persons are under obligation and in duty bound to be obedient to God; but sometimes it implies a constraint, by which the law urges persons to good works.

Afterwards, however, various persons disputed not only concerning the words, but also most violently assailed the doctrine itself, and contended that the new obedience in the regenerated, required by the above mentioned order of God, is not necessary.

For the purpose of explaining this dispute in a Christian manner, according to the analogy of the Word of God, and of finally determining it through his grace, we declare that our doctrine, faith, and confession, are the following:

First, in this article there is no controversy among our divines concerning the following propositions: 'That it is the will, the order, and the command of God, that believers should walk in good works; that those works are not truly good which each one devises himself with a good intention, or which are performed according to human traditions, but those which God himself has prescribed and commanded in his Word; that works truly good are not performed by

our own natural powers, but are then done when the person is reconciled to God through faith, and renewed by the Holy Spirit, or, as St. Paul says: "Created in Christ Jesus unto good works," Eph. 2, 10.

Neither is the manner or cause a matter of dispute, whereby the good works of believers, although they are impure and imperfect in the flesh, are pleasing and acceptable to God; namely, on account of Christ the Lord, through faith, because the person is acceptable to God. For the works, which pertain to the preservation of external discipline, and which are required and performed also by the unbelieving and the unconverted, although they are laudable in the sight of the world, and, besides, rewarded of God in this world with temporal blessings; yet, because they do not proceed from genuine faith, they are sins before God, that is, they are contaminated with sins, and they are held in the sight of God as sins and uncleanness, in consequence of the corrupt nature, and because the person is not reconciled to God. For, "a corrupt tree cannot bring forth good fruit," Matt. 7, 18; and, as it is also written, Rom. 14, 23: "Whatsoever is not of faith is sin." For a person must first be acceptable to God, and that for the sake of Christ alone, if by any means the works of this same person shall be pleasing to God.

Therefore, the source and the fountain of works which are really good and acceptable in the sight of God, and which God will reward in this and in the future world, must be *faith*; for this reason they are called by St. Paul the true fruits of faith, as also of the Spirit, Gal. 5, 22. For "faith (as Dr. Luther writes in his preface to the Epistle of St. Paul to the Romans) is a divine work in us, which changes us, and regenerates us of God, and mortifies the old Adam, making us quite different persons, in heart, mind, disposition, and in all our faculties, and bringing with itself the Holy Spirit. Oh! this faith is a living, active, efficacious, powerful principle; it must incessantly perform that which is good. It never asks whether good works are to be performed, but before the inquiry is made, it has done them, and it is always in action. But he who does not perform such works, has no faith, and gropes and looks about for faith and good works, not knowing what they are, yet prating and talking much about them. Faith is a living, unshaken confidence in the grace of God, so firm, that the person would rather die a thousand times than permit this confidence to be wrested from him. And this confidence and knowledge of divine grace, make us courageous, cheerful, and joyful toward God and all creatures, all of which the Holy Spirit accomplishes through faith. Hence man with-

out constraint, becomes willing and desirous to do good unto all, to serve all, and to endure all things to the honor and praise of God who manifested this grace to him ; so that it is impossible to separate works from faith ; yes, as impossible as it is to separate heat and light from fire."

But, since there is no dispute among our divines concerning these points, we shall not treat them here at length, but we shall explain merely the controverted points in a simple and perspicuous manner.

And first, in regard to the necessity or voluntariness of good works, it is evident that these expressions are used and frequently repeated in the Augsburg Confession and in the Apology, namely, that good works are necessary. Again, that it is necessary to do good works, which should also necessarily follow faith and reconciliation to God. Again, that we should and must necessarily perform the good works which God commanded. Thus also in the Holy Scripture itself, the words *necessity*, *necessary*, and *needful*, and *shall* and *must*, are thus used, with respect to that which we are under obligation to perform in consequence of the order, command, and will of God, Rom. 13, 5 ; 1 Cor. 9, 16 ; Acts 5, 29 ; John 15, 12 ; 1 John 4, 21.

Wherefore, in this Christian and genuine sense, those propositions or expressions which we have mentioned, are unjustly reprehended and rejected by some. For they should justly be retained and employed for the purpose of reproving and confuting the secure, Epicurean delusion, that a dead faith or a vain persuasion which is destitute of repentance and good works, is true faith ; as if, indeed, there can at the same time exist in one heart true faith and an evil purpose to persevere and go on in sins—a thing which is impossible ; or as if, indeed, a person can have and retain true faith, righteousness, and salvation, although he remains a corrupt and barren tree, from which no good fruits at all proceed ; yes, even when, contrary to his conscience, he perseveres in sins, or designedly turns unto these sins again. These are false and unholy sentiments.

But here also this distinction must be observed, namely, that by the word *necessity* must be understood *necessitas ordinis, mandati, et voluntatis Christi ac debiti nostri, non autem necessitas coactionis* ; that is, when the word *necessity* is used, it must be understood, not with respect to constraint, but alone with respect to the order of the immutable will of God, whose debtors we are. For it is the commandment of God, that the creature should be obedient to the Creator. For in those other places of Scripture, as in 2 Cor. 9, 7 ; and in the Epistle of St. Paul to Philemon, verse 14 : again,

in 1 Pet. 5, 2, the word, *necessity*, is applied to that which is extorted from a person contrary to his will, through constraint, or which he otherwise does for the sake of the outward appearance, but yet without and contrary to his will. For, such hypocritical works God does not accept; for the people of the New Testament shall be a willing people, (Psalm 110, 3,) and sacrifice willingly, (Psalm 54, 6,) and be obedient, not with unwillingness, or through constraint, but from the heart, 2 Cor. 9, 7; Rom. 6, 17. "For God loveth a cheerful giver," 2 Cor. 9, 7. In this sense and meaning, it is rightly asserted and taught that works truly good shall be performed by those whom the Son of God has freed, willingly, or in a willing spirit; and, indeed, the discussion concerning the voluntariness of good works, was by some maintained chiefly in this sense.

But here again the distinction also must be observed, concerning which Paul, Rom. 7, 22, 23, speaks: I am willing, and "delight in the law of God, after the inward man: but I see another law in my members," not only unwilling, or disinclined, but "warring against the law of my mind." And in regard to the unwilling and rebellious flesh, Paul, 1 Cor. 9, 27, says: "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection." And Gal. 5, 24, and Rom. 8, 13: "They that are Christ's have crucified," yes, mortified, "the flesh, with the affections and lusts." But that pretence or doctrine is false and must be rejected, which asserts that good works are so free in the case of believers, that it lies within their own free choice either to perform or to omit them, or to act contrary to them, and still be able to retain faith, and the favor and grace of God.

Secondly, when it is taught that good works are necessary, it must be explained why, and from what causes they are necessary; which causes are recited in the Augsburg Confession and in the Apology.

But here we must exercise very great caution, lest works be introduced and intermingled in the article of justification and salvation. Wherefore, these propositions are wisely rejected:—That good works are necessary for believers in order to salvation: so much so that it is impossible to be saved without good works. For they are diametrically opposed to the doctrine *de particulis exclusivis in articulo justificationis et salvationis*; that is, they militate against those words by which St. Paul entirely excludes our works and merit from the article of justification and salvation, and ascribes all to the grace of God and to the merits of Christ alone, as we explained in the foregoing article. And again, these propositions deprive troubled and afflicted consciences of the comfort of the Gospel: they give occasion for doubt; they are dangerous in

many ways; they confirm the arrogance of self-righteousness, and confidence in our own works; besides, they are adopted by the Papists, and employed to their advantage against the pure doctrine concerning that faith by which alone man is saved. Thus also they are contrary to the form of sound words, since it is written: that blessedness is his alone unto whom God imputes righteousness, without the addition of works, Rom. 4, 6. Again, in the Augsburg Confession, in the sixth article, it is written, that we are saved without works, through faith alone. Thus too, Dr. Luther rejected and condemned these propositions:

1. When he refers to the false teachers who led the Galatians astray.

2. In many of his writings concerning the Papists.

3. He rejected them in the case of the Anabaptists, who set forth this comment: "That faith indeed ought not to depend on the merit of works, but that they are nevertheless required as necessary to salvation;"

4. And he also rejected them in the case of some who were connected with him, and who wished to explain this proposition: "Although we require works as necessary to salvation, yet we do not teach that men ought to put their trust in them." (Comment on Gen. ch. 22.)

Therefore, for the sake of the reasons now stated, the forms of expression which have been mentioned—which were revived, spread abroad, and controverted by reason of the *Interim*, in the time of persecution, when a clear and perspicuous confession was most necessary in opposition to the various corruptions and perversions of the article of justification—should not be taught, maintained, or tolerated in our churches, but should be exposed and rejected by them as false and unrighteous.

Thirdly, since it is also disputed whether good works secure salvation, or whether they are necessary for the preservation of faith, righteousness, and salvation, and since much depends on this point, it must be diligently and properly explained in what manner righteousness and salvation are secured in us from being lost again. For it is written: "He that shall endure unto the end the same shall be saved," Matt. 24, 13. Again, Heb. 3, 6, 14: "For we are made partakers of Christ, if we hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end."

And therefore, in the first place, this false, Epicurean opinion must be seriously rebuked and rejected, according to which some imagine that faith and the righteousness and salvation received, can-

not be lost by the commission of any, even wanton and wilful sins; but that even if, without fear and shame, a Christian indulges in evil lusts, resists the Holy Spirit, and wilfully turns to sin contrary to his own conscience, he can nevertheless retain faith, the grace of God, righteousness, and salvation.

In opposition to this pernicious opinion, these true, immutable, divine threatenings, earnest denunciations, and admonitions, should be frequently repeated and inculcated, with all diligence and earnestness, among those Christians who have been justified by faith, 1 Cor. 6, 9, 10: "Be not deceived: neither fornicators, nor idolaters, nor adulterers, nor thieves, &c., shall inherit the kingdom of God." Gal. 5, 21; Eph. 5, 5: "They which do such things shall not inherit the kingdom of God." Rom. 8, 13: "If ye live after the flesh, ye shall die." Col. 3, 6: "For which things' sake the wrath of God cometh on the children of disobedience."

The Apology, however, furnishes a happy illustration of the occasion on which, and the manner in which, on these grounds, the admonition to good works may be inculcated, without obscuring the doctrine concerning faith, and the article of justification; where, in the twentieth article, concerning the declaration of Peter,—2 Pet. 1, 10: "Give diligence to make your calling and election sure,"—it says: "Peter indicates a reason for the performance of good works, namely, in order that we may make our calling sure; that is, that we may not fall from the Gospel, when we sin again. He wishes to say: do good works, in order that you may remain under the Gospel, in your heavenly calling, that you may not fall back, become cold, and lose that spirit and gift which were imparted unto you by grace through Christ,—not on account of the works which follow; for men remain firm in their calling through faith; but faith and the Holy Spirit do not remain in those who lead a sinful life." Thus far the words of the Apology.

But on the contrary, it must not be understood that faith in the beginning only apprehends righteousness and salvation, and afterwards resigns its office to works, so that henceforth these must preserve faith, and the received righteousness and salvation. But in order that the promise, not only of receiving, but also of retaining righteousness and salvation, may remain firm and sure to us, Paul, Rom. 5, 2, ascribes to faith not only our access to grace, but also our standing in grace, and rejoicing in hope of the glory of God. That is, he attributes all to faith alone, the beginning, the middle, and the end. Again, Rom. 11, 20: "Because of unbelief, they were broken off, and thou standest by faith." Col. 1, 21-23:

“You hath he reconciled,—to present you holy, and unblamable, and unreprouable, in his sight; if ye continue in the faith.” 1 Pet. 1, 5, 9: “Who are kept by the power of God through faith unto salvation.” Again, “Receiving the end of your faith, even the salvation of your souls.”

Since, therefore, it is evident from the Word of God that faith is the only proper medium through which righteousness and salvation are not only received, but also preserved of God, the decree of the Council of Trent [Sess. 6, *De Justific. can. 24.*] must justly be rejected, and whatever else may have been resolved in this sense, namely, that our good works secure salvation, or, that the received righteousness of faith, or even faith itself, is retained and secured by our works, either wholly or at least in part.

For, although, previous to this controversy, many sound teachers used these and similar phrases in the explanation of the holy Scriptures, not however, by any means intending to confirm by them the errors of the Papists already referred to; yet, inasmuch as a controversy afterwards arose concerning these phrases, from which controversy, offences and distractions of various kinds resulted, it is safest, according to the admonition of St. Paul, 2 Tim. 1, 13, to hold fast the form of sound words with no less diligence, than the pure doctrine itself; by which means many unnecessary contentions may be avoided, and the church secured from many offences.

Fourthly, with respect to the proposition, that good works are pernicious to salvation, we express ourselves distinctly, in the following manner:—If any one introduces good works into the article of justification, placing his righteousness or his confidence of salvation upon them, wishing to merit the grace of God and to be saved by them, not we alone declare, but Paul himself declares, and thrice repeats it, Phil. 3, 7, 8, 9, that the works of such a person are not only useless and an impediment, but also pernicious. The fault, however, is not in the good works themselves, but in the false confidence which is placed in works, contrary to the express Word of God.

By no means, however, does it follow from this that any one should make the absolute and unqualified assertion, that good works are pernicious to believers with respect to their salvation. For good works in believers, when performed *propter veras causas, et ad veras fines*, that is, with that view in which God requires them from the regenerate, are an indication of salvation, Phil. 1, 11. And, indeed, it is the will and express command of God, that believers should perform good works, which the Holy Spirit works in be-

lievers; and these God accepts on account of Christ, and promises to them a glorious reward in this life and in that which is to come.

For this reason also, this proposition is reprehended and rejected in our churches; because, when it is thus put forth without any qualification, it is false and offensive, and by it all discipline and honesty of life may be checked, and a rude, dissolute, secure, and Epicurean life be introduced and confirmed. For every one should guard most diligently against that which is pernicious to his salvation.

But since Christians should not be deterred from good works, but with the greatest diligence should be admonished and encouraged to do them, this naked and unqualified proposition can not and must not be tolerated, taught, or defended in the church.

V. OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

Inasmuch as the distinction between the Law and the Gospel is a peculiarly glorious light, which contributes to a right dividing (2 Tim. 2, 15) of the Word of God, and to a proper explanation and understanding of the writings of the holy Prophets and Apostles, it must be retained with the greatest diligence, lest these two divisions of doctrines be commingled, or the Gospel be transformed into a law; by which course the merits of Christ would be obscured, and afflicted consciences would be deprived of that comfort which they otherwise have in the Gospel, if it is preached purely and sincerely, and by which they can sustain themselves in their severest trials, against the terrors of the law.

Now, on this subject too, a controversy has arisen between some divines of the Augsburg Confession. For the one party have asserted that the Gospel is properly not only a preaching of grace, but also at the same time a preaching of repentance, reproving the greatest sin, namely, that of unbelief. But the other party have contended that the Gospel is not properly a preaching of repentance, reproving sin; for this is properly the office of the law of God, which reproves all sins, and consequently unbelief also; but, that the Gospel is properly a preaching of the grace and mercy of God, for Christ's sake, through whom is remitted and forgiven, unto those who are converted to Christ, the unbelief in which they previously lived, and which was reproved by the law of God.

Now, on considering this dissension properly, it is found to have originated chiefly from the fact, that the word *Gospel* is not always used and understood in one and the same sense, but in two senses,

in the holy Scriptures, as also by the ancient and modern teachers of the church. For sometimes it is so used that the whole doctrine of Christ, our Lord, is understood by it, which he set forth during his ministry upon earth, and in the New Testament commanded to be taught, and thus he has comprehended in it the explanation of the law, and the revelation of the benevolence and grace of God, his heavenly Father, as it is written, Mark 1, 1: "The beginning of the Gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God." And a little afterwards, we find the leading principles summarily proposed—repentance and forgiveness of sins. Thus, where Christ after his resurrection commands the Apostles to preach the Gospel to all the world, (Mark 16, 15,) he comprehends the sum of his doctrine in a few words, saying, Luke 24, 46, 47: "Thus it is written, and thus it behooved Christ to suffer, and to rise from the dead the third day; and that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." Paul likewise calls his whole doctrine *the Gospel*, and arranges the contents of this doctrine under the heads of repentance toward God, and faith toward Christ, Acts 20, 21. And in this sense the *generalis definitio*, that is, the description of the word *Gospel*, is correct, when it is used in its widest sense, and without reference to the proper distinction between the Law and the Gospel, if it be said, "The Gospel is the preaching of repentance and the remission of sins." For John the Baptist, Christ, and the Apostles in their preaching commenced with the doctrine of repentance, and thus they explained and urged, not only the gracious promise concerning the forgiveness of sins, but the law of God also. Finally, the word *Gospel* is used in another, namely, its proper sense, in which it embraces, not the preaching of repentance, but only the preaching of the grace of God, as it follows immediately afterwards, Mark 1, 15, where Christ says: "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel."

But the word *repentance*, likewise, is not always used in one and the same sense in the Scripture. For in some places in the holy Scriptures it is used and taken for the whole conversion of man, as in Luke 13, 5: "Except ye repent, ye shall all likewise perish." And Luke 15, 7: "Joy shall be in heaven over one sinner that repenteth." But in the passage, Mark 1, 15, to which we referred above, and in other places, where repentance and faith in Christ are distinguished from each other, Acts 20, 21, or repentance and remission of sins, Luke 24, 46, 47, *repentance* signifies nothing else but to acknowledge sins truly, to feel sincere sorrow on account of them, and to abstain from them. This acknowledgment of sins comes from

the law, but it is not sufficient for a salutary conversion to God, if faith in Christ be not superadded, whose merits the consolatory preaching of the holy Gospel offers to all penitent sinners, that are alarmed by the preaching of the law. For the Gospel announces remission of sins, not to the careless and secure, but to the contrite and penitent, Luke 4, 18. And lest this contrition and terror of the law might terminate in despair, the preaching of the Gospel is necessary, so that there may be a repentance to salvation, 2 Cor. 7, 10.

For since the mere preaching of the law without the mention of Christ, either renders men presumptuous enough to imagine that they can fulfil the law by external works, or else causes them to fall into despair, therefore Christ, Matt. 5, 21, &c.; Rom. 7, 14; 1, 18, takes the law in his hands, and explains it spiritually. And thus he reveals his wrath from heaven against all sinners, showing how great it is; thus they are directed to the law, and thence first they learn properly to acknowledge their sins, which acknowledgment Moses never could have wrested from them. For, as the Apostle, 2 Cor. 3, 14, 15, testifies, although Moses be read, yet the veil, which he put over his face, still remains untaken away; so that they do not perceive the law spiritually, and the momentous things which it requires of us, and the severity with which it accurses and condemns us, because we are unable to keep and fulfil it, "But when they shall turn to the Lord, the veil shall be taken away," 2 Cor. 3, 16.

Therefore, the Spirit of Christ, necessarily, not only consoles, but also, through the office of the law, reproves the world of sin, John 16, 8, and thus proceeds in the New Testament, as the Prophet says: *Opus alienum, ut faciat opus proprium*, Isa. 28, 21; that is, he must do a "strange or foreign work," (which is to reprove,) until he advances to his own work, which is, to console, and to preach concerning grace. For this cause he was obtained for us and sent to us through Christ, and thence is called the Comforter, as Dr. Luther has explained in his exposition of the Gospel, *Dominic. V. post Trin.* in the following words:

"All that describes our sins and the wrath of God, is properly the preaching of the law, no matter how or when it occurs. Again, the Gospel is a preaching which exhibits and presents nothing else but grace and forgiveness in Christ, although it is true and correct that the Apostles and ministers of the Gospel, as even Christ himself has done, confirm the preaching of the law, and commence with it among those who do not yet acknowledge their sins, and are not alarmed in consequence of the wrath of God, as he himself

says: 'The Holy Ghost will reprove the world of sin—because they believe not on me,' John 16, 8, 9. Yea, what is a more severe or terrible indication and preaching of the wrath of God against sin, than the very sufferings and death of Christ his Son? But as long as all this proclaims the wrath of God, and terrifies men, it is not properly the preaching of the Gospel, nor Christ's preaching, but that of Moses and the law against the impenitent. For Christ and the Gospel were not ordained and given, either to alarm or to condemn, but to console and to strengthen those who are alarmed and depressed." And again, "Christ (John 16, 8,) says: 'The Holy Ghost will reprove the world of sin;' but this cannot take place, unless through the explanation of the law," *Tom. 2, Senens. f. 455*.

Thus the Smalcald Articles also assert: "This office of the law the New Testament retains and enforces," which reveals sins, and the wrath of God; "but under this office the New Testament instantly subjoins the consolatory promises of grace, through the Gospel." See part III, Art. 3, of the Smalcald Articles.

And the Apology declares that it is not sufficient for a true and salutary repentance to preach the law alone, but the Gospel must also be preached. In this manner both these doctrines are connected, and they must both be urged together—but in a certain order, and with due distinction. And the Antinomians, the adversaries of the law, are justly condemned, who banish the preaching of the law from the church, and affirm that sins are to be reproved, and that contrition and sorrow are to proceed, not from the law, but only from the Gospel. See Art. V.

But in order that all may see that we keep nothing concealed in this controversy, we shall present our views of the whole matter, before the eyes of the Christian reader, in a simple and perspicuous manner.

Accordingly, we believe, teach, and confess unanimously; that the *Law* is properly a divine doctrine, in which the righteous and immutable will of God is revealed, teaching what man ought to be in his nature, thoughts, words, and deeds, in order to be pleasing and acceptable to God. And it announces that the wrath of God, and temporal and eternal punishments will come upon transgressors. For, as Luther declares in opposition to the Antinomians, all that reprove sins belongs to the law, the proper office of which is, to reprove sin, and to conduct to the knowledge of sin, Rom. 3, 20, and 7, 7. And, inasmuch as unbelief is the source and fountain of all sins which ought to be rebuked, the law condemns unbelief also.

Yet it is also true, that the law and its teaching, are illustrated

and explained by the Gospel; while it remains properly the office of the law to reprove sins and inculcate good works.

Thus the law reproves unbelief, if we do not believe the Word of God. Now, since the Gospel, which alone properly teaches and commands us to believe in Christ, is the Word of God, the Holy Spirit therefore, through the office of the law, reproves this unbelief too, because sinners believe not in Christ; although the Gospel alone properly teaches concerning saving faith in Christ.

But the Gospel is properly a doctrine which teaches (since man kept not the law of God, but transgressed it, his corrupt nature, thoughts, words, and deeds contending against it, and being for this reason subject to the wrath of God, to death, to all temporal afflictions, and to the punishment of hell) what man is to *believe*, that he may obtain remission of sins before God; namely, that the Son of God, Christ our Lord, has taken upon himself the curse of the law, has borne it, and has atoned and made expiation for all our sins; through whom alone we are again restored to favor with God, by faith obtain remission of sins, are liberated from death and from all the punishments of sins, and are eternally saved.

For all that consoles, all that offers to the transgressors of the law the favor and grace of God, is properly called the Gospel, or the good and joyful tidings that God, for the sake of Christ, will forgive sins, and not inflict punishment.

Wherefore, every penitent should believe, that is, place his whole confidence in Christ the Lord alone, namely, that He was delivered for our offences, and was raised again for our justification, Rom. 4, 25; who, although he knew no sin, was made to be sin for us, 2 Cor. 5, 21; that we might be made the righteousness of God in him, 2 Cor. 5, 21,—who was made unto us righteousness, 1 Cor. 1, 30—whose obedience is imputed unto us for righteousness before God in his strict judgment; so that the law, as we have shown above, is a ministration of death through the letter, pronouncing condemnation, 2 Cor. 3, 7. But the “Gospel is the power of God unto salvation to every one that believeth,” Rom. 1, 16; proclaiming righteousness, and giving the Spirit. Indeed Dr. Luther has thus urged this distinction in nearly all his writings with special diligence, clearly showing that the knowledge of God, which originates from the Gospel, is far different from that which is taught and learned from the law, since even the heathens had a knowledge of God to some extent from the natural law, although they neither knew him correctly, nor honored him rightly, Rom. 1, 20, 21.

From the beginning of the world these two doctrines were incul-

cated together in the church of God, yet always with due distinction. For the posterity of the venerable Patriarchs, as also the Patriarchs themselves, did not only continually recall to their minds that God created man holy and righteous in the beginning, and that through the deception of the serpent, he transgressed the law of God, became a sinner, ruined himself with all his posterity, and plunged them with himself into death and eternal condemnation: but they also comforted themselves again and were strengthened by the preaching concerning the seed of the woman, which should bruise the head of the serpent, Gen. 3, 15; again, concerning the seed of Abraham, in which all the nations of the earth should be blessed, Gen. 22, 18, and concerning the son of David, who should restore the kingdom of Israel, and be a light unto the Gentiles, and who was wounded for our transgressions, and bruised for our iniquities, with whose stripes we are healed, Psalm 110, 1, 2; Isa. 49, 6; Luke 2, 32; Isa. 53, 5.

We believe and confess that these two doctrines must be urged continually in the church of God with diligence, until the end of the world, yet with that distinction which properly belongs to them; in order that in the ministration of the New Testament, the hearts of impenitent men may be alarmed, and brought to a knowledge of their sins and to repentance, by the preaching of the law and its threatenings; yet not in such a manner as to cause them to despond or despair; but (since the law is a schoolmaster to bring us unto Christ, that we may be justified by faith, Gal. 3, 24, and thus directs and leads us, not *from* Christ, but *to* Christ, who is the end of the law, Rom. 10, 4,) to be thus consoled and strengthened again by the preaching of the holy Gospel concerning Christ our Lord, namely, that if they believe the Gospel, God forgives them all their sins through Christ, receives them as children for his sake, and justifies and saves them out of pure grace, without any merit of their own, but nevertheless, not in such a manner as to induce them to abuse the grace of God, and willingly commit sin in consequence of their trust in this mercy. And this distinction between the Law and the Gospel, Paul points out expressly and forcibly, 2 Cor. 3, 6, &c.

Therefore, lest these two doctrines, the Law and the Gospel, should be intermingled or confounded, and that which belongs to the one be attributed to the other, the true and proper difference between the law and the Gospel must be retained and urged with the greatest diligence, and all that might occasion confusion between the law and the Gospel, by which both doctrines, the law and the Gospel, might be confused and commingled into one doctrine, must be assid-

uously avoided. For otherwise the merits and benefits conferred by Christ might easily be obscured, and the Gospel be transformed into a doctrine of law, as it came to pass under the Papacy. And thus Christians might be deprived of that true consolation, which they have in the Gospel against the terrors of the law, and the door be opened again by which the Papacy might re-enter the church of God. It is, therefore, dangerous and wrong to assert that the Gospel, when it is properly so called, and when it is distinguished from the law, is a preaching of repentance, reproving sin. But otherwise, if it is understood in general concerning the whole Christian doctrine, the Apology also asserts several times, that the Gospel is a preaching of repentance and of remission of sins. But nevertheless, the Apology also indicates in the mean time, that the Gospel is properly the promise of the remission of sins and of justification through Christ; but that the law is a declaration which reproves and condemns sin.

VI. OF THE THIRD USE OF THE LAW OF GOD.

Inasmuch as the law of God is useful, not only in preserving external discipline and honesty in opposition to the rude and disobedient, and likewise in bringing men to a knowledge of their sins; but also when they are born anew by the Spirit of God, converted to the Lord, and when the veil of Moses is taken away from them, in teaching them to live and walk according to the law, a controversy arose among a few theologians, concerning this third and last use of the law. The one party taught and held, that it is not necessary that the regenerate should learn from the law the new obedience or the good works in which they ought to walk, neither should this doctrine be urged from it, since they are made free by the Son of God, have become temples of his Spirit, and being free, they of themselves, (even as the sun of himself, without any compulsion, performs his regular course,) through the inspiration and impulse of the Holy Spirit, perform that which God requires of them. In opposition to this, the other party taught, that although genuine believers are truly led by the Spirit of God, and consequently, after the inward man, they do the will of God out of a free spirit, yet the Holy Spirit uses the written law for their instruction; through which even true believers learn to serve God, not according to their own thoughts, but according to his written law and word, which are a certain rule and guide for a holy life and conduct, regulated according to the eternal and immutable will of God.

In order to explain and determine this dispute, we believe, teach, and confess unanimously, that, although true believers and Christians who are really converted to God and justified, are released and liberated from the curse of the law, they should nevertheless exercise themselves daily in the law of the Lord, as it is written, Psalm 1, 2, and 119, 1: *Blessed is the man whose delight is in the law of the Lord, and who meditates in it day and night.* For the law is a mirror, in which the will of God and that which is pleasing to him, are properly portrayed; it should, therefore, be continually impressed upon believers, and urged among them diligently and incessantly.

For, although, as the Apostle, 1 Tim. 1, 9, testifies, the law is not made for the righteous, but for the unrighteous; yet this must not be so understood as if the righteous should live without law; for the law of God is written in their hearts, (Rom. 2, 15; Heb. 8, 8, and 10, 16,) and unto the first man immediately after his creation there was also a law given, according to which he should live. But the true meaning of St. Paul is, that the law cannot burden with its curse those who are reconciled unto God through Christ, and that it cannot harass or constrain the regenerate, for they delight in the law of God, after the inward man, (Rom. 7, 22.)

And indeed, if the believing and elect children of God were perfectly renewed in this life by the indwelling Spirit, so that they would be entirely freed from sin in their nature and all its faculties, they would need no law, and consequently no impulse; but of themselves, and with entire voluntariness, without any instruction, admonition, solicitation, or urging of the law, they would do that which they are under obligation to do according to the will of God: even as the sun, the moon, and all the heavenly bodies, perform of themselves their regular course unimpeded, without admonition, solicitation, urging, or force, according to the order of God, which he once established for them; yes, as the holy angels render an entirely voluntary obedience.

But inasmuch as believers are not perfectly and entirely (*complete vel consummative*), renewed in this life, although their sins are covered by the perfect obedience of Christ, so that they are not imputed to them unto condemnation, and although the mortification of the old Adam and the renewing in the spirit of their minds are commenced by the Holy Spirit, yet the old Adam ever inheres in their nature and in all its internal and external powers; concerning which the Apostle, Rom. 7, 18, writes: "I know that in me (that is, in my flesh) dwelleth no good thing;" and moreover, in

verse 15: "For that which I do, I allow not: for what I would, that do I not; but what I hate, that do I." Again, verse 23: "I see another law in my members, warring against the law of my mind, and bringing me into captivity to the law of sin." Again, Gal. 5, 17: "The flesh lusteth against the Spirit, and the Spirit against the flesh: and these are contrary the one to the other; so that ye cannot do the things that ye would."

Wherefore, in consequence of this lusting of the flesh, the truly believing, elect, and regenerate children of God, in this life, need, not only the daily instruction and admonition, the warning and threatenings of the law, but also frequently chastisements, in order that they may be reinvigorated, and may submit to the Spirit of God, as it is written, Psalm 119, 71: "It is good for me that I have been afflicted; that I might learn thy statutes." And again, 1 Cor. 9, 27: "I keep under my body, and bring it into subjection; lest that by any means, when I have preached to others, I myself should be a cast-away." Again, Heb. 12, 8: "If ye be without chastisement, whereof all are partakers, then are ye bastards, and not sons;" as Dr. Luther has fully explained this in his exposition of the Scripture Lesson for the nineteenth Sunday after Trinity.

But that which the Gospel performs, works, and accomplishes in the new obedience of believers, and that which is the office of the law therein, so far as the good works of believers are concerned, must be separately explained.

For the law declares, indeed, that it is the will and command of God, that we should walk in a new life, but it does not give the power and ability by which we can begin and accomplish this new obedience. But the Holy Spirit, who is given and received, not through the law, but through the preaching of the Gospel, renews the heart of man, Gal. 3, 5, 14. Afterwards the Holy Spirit uses the law for the purpose of teaching, through it, the regenerate; and in the Ten Commandments he indicates that which is the good, the acceptable and perfect will of God, Rom. 12, 3; in which good works God has before ordained that we should walk, Eph. 2, 10. The Holy Spirit exhorts them unto good works, and, if in these they are remiss and negligent, or disobedient in consequence of the flesh, he reproves them for it through the law. In this manner he bears both offices together;—he slays and he makes alive; he brings down to the pit, and he brings up again; it is his office not only to console, but also to reprove, as it is written, John 16, 8: "When the Holy Spirit is come, he will reprove the world" (in which the old Adam is comprehended) "of sin, and of righteousness, and of judgment."

But all that is contrary to the law of God is sin. And St. Paul, 2 Tim. 3, 16, asserts: "All Scripture is given by inspiration of God, and is profitable for doctrine, for reproof," &c., and to reprove, is the proper office of the law. Therefore, as often as believers stumble, they are reprov'd by the Holy Spirit through the law, and again raised up and consoled by this same Spirit through the preaching of the holy Gospel.

But in order to avoid, as much as possible, all misunderstanding, and to teach and maintain properly, the distinction between the works of the law and those of the Spirit, it must be remarked with special diligence, when good works are spoken of, which are conformable to the law of God, (for otherwise they are not good works,) that the word *law* signifies one thing only, namely, the immutable *will* of God, according to which, in their whole course of conduct, men should act.

The difference in works, however, arises, in consequence of the difference in the persons who endeavor to live according to this law and will of God. For as long as a man is unregenerated, and endeavors to live according to the law, doing its works because they are commanded, through the fear of punishment or the hope of reward, he is still under the law, and his works are by St. Paul properly called works of the law; for they are extorted by the law as from bondmen, who like Cain, are unwilling worshippers.

But when a person is born anew through the Spirit of God, and is made free from the law, that is, from the constraint of the law, and is led by the Spirit of Christ, he lives according to the unchangeable will of God revealed in the law, and does all, so far as he is born anew, through a free and cheerful spirit. And such works are not properly called works of the law, but works and fruits of the Spirit, (Gal. 5, 22,) or, as St. Paul, Rom. 7, 23, 25, terms it, *the law of the mind*, and 1 Cor. 9, 21, *the law of Christ*. For such persons are not under the law, but under grace, as St. Paul, Rom. 6, 14; 8, 2, declares.

Since, however, believers are not perfectly renewed in this life, but the old Adam cleaves to them even to their graves, the contest between the Spirit and the flesh also continues. Therefore, they "delight in the law of God, after the inward man," Rom. 7, 22; but the law in their members wars against the law of their mind. Thus they are never without law, and yet they are not *under*, but *in the law*, living and walking in the law of the Lord, and yet performing nothing through constraint of the law.

But with respect to the old Adam, who still inheres in them, he

must be coerced, not only by the law, but by chastisement; he nevertheless does all unwillingly and through constraint, no less than the ungodly, who are urged by the threatenings of the law, and kept in obedience, 1 Cor. 9, 27, and Rom. 7, 18, 19.

Further, this doctrine of the law is likewise necessary for believers, lest they should depend on their own sanctity and devotion, and under the pretext of the Spirit of God, institute self-chosen methods of worship, without the word and command of God, as it is written, Deut. 12, 8, 28, 32: "Ye shall not do after all the things that we do here this day, every man whatsoever is right in his own eyes." "What thing soever I command you, observe to do it: thou shalt not add thereto, nor diminish from it."

Moreover, the doctrine of the law is also necessary to believers in the exercise of good works for this reason, that otherwise a person may very easily imagine that his works and life are entirely pure and perfect. But the law of God exhibits good works to believers, as in a mirror, in order to teach us that they remain imperfect and unclean during this life; so that we must say with Paul: "I know nothing by myself; yet am I not hereby justified," 1 Cor. 4, 4. Thus, where Paul exhorts the regenerate to good works, he expressly holds forth unto them the Ten Commandments, Rom. 13, 8; and the fact that his good works are imperfect and unclean, he perceives from the law, Rom. 7, 7, &c. And David, Psalm 119, 32, says: "I will run the way of thy commandments." But "enter not into judgment with thy servant: for in thy sight shall no man living be justified," Psalm 143, 2.

But the law does not teach in what manner and for what reason, the good works of believers, although they are imperfect and unclean in this life, in consequence of the sin which inheres in the flesh, are nevertheless acceptable and well-pleasing to God; it requires rather an obedience altogether perfect and pure, in order to please God. But the Gospel teaches, that our spiritual sacrifices are acceptable to God through faith for Christ's sake, 1 Pet. 2, 5; Heb. 11, 4, &c., and ch. 13, 16, 21. In this manner Christians are not under the law, but under grace, because they are freed from the curse and condemnation of the law through faith in Christ, and because their good works, although still imperfect and unclean, are acceptable to God through Christ; because, moreover, so far as they are born anew after the inward man, they do from their hearts that which is pleasing to God, not through the constraint of the law, but through the renewal of the Holy Spirit. But nevertheless, they sustain a continual struggle with the old Adam.

For the old Adam, like an unruly and obstinate animal, still constitutes a portion of them, and must be forced into the obedience of Christ, not only by the teaching, admonition, urging, and threatening of the law, but frequently by the rod of chastisement and affliction, until this sinful flesh is wholly and entirely put off, and man is perfectly renewed in the resurrection. Then, he will no longer need either the preaching of the law, or its threatenings and chastisements, or the preaching of the Gospel, which belongs to this imperfect life. But as they will behold God face to face, so through the power of the indwelling Spirit of God, they will do the will of God freely, without any constraint, and without any impediment, most purely and perfectly, with the highest joy, delighting in God eternally.

Accordingly, we reject and condemn as a dangerous error, pernicious to Christian discipline and true piety, the doctrine which asserts that the law is not to be urged in the manner and to the extent mentioned above, among Christians and true believers, but only among the unbelieving, the impious, and the impenitent.

VII. OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

Although the exposition of this article should not, according to the opinion of some perhaps, be introduced into this treatise, in which we design to explain only those articles which were brought into controversy among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, (from which Confession the Sacramentarians very soon withdrew and separated themselves entirely, when it was first written, and delivered to the Emperor, at Augsburg, A. D. 1530, in order that they might present their own confession,) yet—inasmuch as some theologians and others, alas! who boast of adhering to the Augsburg Confession, subsequently concurred with the Sacramentarians in this article, and no longer secretly, but publicly to some extent, and also contrary to the testimony of their own conscience, offered violence to the Augsburg Confession, as if it agreed entirely with the doctrine of the Sacramentarians on this article, and in this manner desired to pervert it—we cannot forbear to testify to the divine truth also in this treatise by our confession, repeating the true meaning and the proper sense of the words of Christ, and of the Augsburg Confession, concerning this article. For we acknowledge it to be our duty, so far as we are able, by the help of God, to secure this pious doctrine for posterity, and faithfully to warn our hearers, with

other pious Christians, against this pernicious error, which is repugnant to the holy and divine Word and to the Augsburg Confession, and which has so often been condemned.

The chief controversy between ourselves and the Sacramentarians, in respect to this article.

Although some Sacramentarians labor to approach in their terms as nearly as possible to the Augsburg Confession, and to use the form or manner of expression employed by our churches; and although they confess that the body of Christ is truly received, by believers, in the holy Sacrament of the Lord's Supper; yet, when they are urged to express their meaning distinctly, sincerely, and plainly, they all unanimously declare that the true, essential body and blood of Christ are as far absent from the consecrated bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, as the highest heaven is from earth. For this is their own language: *Abesse Christi corpus et sanguinem a signis tanto intervallo dicimus, quanto abest terra ab altissimis cælis.* That is, We declare that the body and blood of Christ are as far distant from the signs as the earth is from the highest heavens. They consequently understand this presence of the body of Christ, not as being here on earth, but only *respectu fidei*; that is, that by the visible signs, even as by the preached word, our faith being reminded and awakened, elevates itself and ascends above all the heavens, and receives and enjoys the body of Christ, which is there present in heaven, yea, Christ himself with all his benefits, truly and essentially, but yet only spiritually. For they believe that, as the bread and wine are here on earth and not in heaven, so the body of Christ is now in heaven and not on earth; and that therefore, nothing else is received with the lips, in the Lord's Supper, except bread and wine.

Now, at first, they pretended that the Lord's Supper is only an external sign, by which Christians are distinguished from other persons, and that in this sacrament there is nothing else administered but mere bread and wine, the bare signs of the absent body of Christ. But when they discovered that this device was of no avail, they confessed that Christ the Lord is truly present in his Supper, namely, *per communicationem idiomatum*, that is, only according to his divine nature, but not with his body and blood.

Afterwards, when they were urged by the words of Christ to confess that the body of Christ is present in this holy Supper, they still understood and explained it to be only a spiritual presence; that is, that Christ makes us partakers only of his power, operation, and

benefits through faith; since, as they say, by the Spirit of Christ, which is every where present, our bodies, in which the Spirit of Christ dwells here upon earth, are united with the body of Christ, which is in heaven.

Hence these magnificent and specious words deceived many illustrious persons, when they pretended and boasted that they were of no other opinion than that the true, substantial, and living Lord Christ is present in his Supper. But this they understand only concerning his divine nature, and not concerning his body and blood; for they think that these are only in heaven and not elsewhere, and that Christ gives us his true body and blood to eat and to drink, with bread and wine, spiritually, through faith, but not to receive corporeally with the lips.

For, the words of the institution of the Lord's Supper—*Eat, this is my body*—they do not understand properly, as they read, according to the letter, but as figurative expressions; so that *to eat* the body of Christ, signifies nothing else but to *believe*; and the word *body*, is no more than a symbol, that is, a sign or figure of the body of Christ, which is not in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper on earth, but only in heaven. The word *is*, they interpret *sacramentaliter, seu modo significative, ne quis rem cum signis ita putet copulari, ut Christi quoque caro nunc in terris adsit, modo quodam invisibili et incomprehensibili*, that is, that the body of Christ is united with the bread sacramentally or by implication; so that as certainly as pious, believing Christians eat the bread with their mouth, so certainly do they also receive the body of Christ, which is in heaven above, by faith, spiritually. But the doctrine that the body of Christ is essentially, though invisibly and incomprehensibly present in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and received orally with the consecrated bread, even by hypocrites or nominal Christians, they are accustomed to execrate and condemn as a horrid blasphemy.

On the contrary, concerning the Lord's Supper, it is taught in the Augsburg Confession, from the Word of God, thus: "That the true body and blood of Christ are truly present, under the form of bread and wine, in the Lord's Supper, and are there administered and received. And the opposite doctrine," (namely, that of the Sacramentarians, who at the same time delivered their own confession at Augsburg, in which it is asserted, that the body of Christ, since he has ascended to heaven, is not truly and essentially present here on earth in the Sacrament,) "is therefore rejected." The same sentiment is also plainly expressed in the Smaller Catechism of Dr. Luther, in the following words: "The Sacrament of the Altar is the true body and blood of our Lord

Jesus Christ, with bread and wine, instituted by Christ himself, for us Christians to eat and drink." And in the Apology it is not only explained more clearly still, but it is also confirmed by the declaration of Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 16, and by the testimony of Cyril, in these words :

"The tenth article is approved, in which it is confessed that, in the Supper of the Lord, the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, and truly administered with the visible elements, bread and wine, to those who receive the Sacrament. For, since Paul, 1 Cor. 10, 16, asserts : ' The bread which we break, is the communion of the body of Christ,' it would follow that the bread is the communion, not of the body, but of the Spirit of Christ, if not the body of Christ, but only the Holy Spirit were truly present." And we know that not only the Roman church, but the Greek church also, taught the bodily presence of Christ in the holy Supper of the Lord. And the testimony of Cyril is likewise adduced, that in the Supper, Christ dwells also bodily in us, by the communication of his flesh.

Afterwards, when those who delivered their own confession at Augsburg concerning this article, seemed to assent to the Confession of our church, the following *Formula Concordiæ*, that is, Articles, or, Formula of Christian agreement, (which we shall now recite,) was drawn up at Wittenburg, A. D. 1536, between the divines of Saxony and those of Upper Germany, and was subscribed by Dr. Martin Luther, and other theologians of both sides :

"We have heard how Martin Bucer, and the other divines who came with him from the cities, have expressed their sentiments concerning the holy Sacrament of the body and blood of Christ, namely, thus :

"Agreeably to the words of Ireneus, they confess, that in this sacrament there are two things, a terrestrial and a celestial. Accordingly, they believe and teach, that with the bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ are truly and essentially present, administered, and received. And although they deny a transubstantiation, that is, an essential change of the bread and wine into the body and blood of Christ, and do not believe that the body and blood of Christ are included, (*localiter*) locally in the bread, or that they are in any other manner united with it constantly, apart from the use of this sacrament ; yet, they concede that through the sacramental union, the bread is the body of Christ, that is, they believe that when the bread is offered, the body of Christ is also present, and truly exhibited. For apart from this use, when the bread is laid aside, and preserved

in its depository, or when it is borne about and exhibited in procession, as is done under the Papacy, they hold not that the body of Christ is present.

“In the second place, they hold, that the institution of this sacrament established by Christ, is efficacious in the Christian community, and that it does not depend on the worthiness or unworthiness of him who administers this sacrament, nor upon that of the recipient. Therefore, as St. Paul says, (1 Cor. 11, 27,) that the unworthy also receive this sacrament; thus they believe that even unto the unworthy, the body and blood of Christ are truly administered, and the unworthy truly receive the same, if the institution and the command of Christ the Lord be observed. But such persons receive it unto judgment, as St. Paul, 1 Cor. 11, 29, declares; for they misuse this holy sacrament, because they receive it without true repentance and without faith. For it was instituted for the purpose of testifying, that unto those the grace and benefits of Christ are here appropriated, and that those are united with Christ and cleansed by his blood, who truly repent and console themselves through faith in Christ.”

In the following year, when the principal theologians attached to the Augsburg Confession, assembled from all parts of Germany, at Smalcald, and consulted what they should lay before the council, (which it was thought would be convened by the Pope,) concerning the doctrine of the church, those articles were drawn up by Dr. Luther by the advice of all, which are called the Smalcald Articles, and were subscribed unanimously, and individually, by all the theologians. In these articles Dr. Luther embraces the true and genuine meaning of the aforementioned *Formula Concordiæ*, or Articles of Agreement, drawn up at Wittemburg, in brief, but significant and perspicuous terms, agreeing most closely with the words of Christ. For the Sacramentarians had perverted the *Formula Concordiæ*, or Articles of Agreement, established the preceding year, to suit their own purposes; namely, in saying that the body of Christ, with all his benefits, is administered with the bread in no other manner than they are with the words of the Gospel; and that by the sacramental union nothing else is to be understood, but the spiritual presence of Christ the Lord through faith. These evasions and subterfuges, resorted to by the Sacramentarians, are opposed by the Smalcald Articles. For these assert that bread and wine in the Supper, are the true body and blood of Christ,* and are administered and received not only by pious, but also by those who are only nominally Christians.

* In reference to this subject, see note on page 384.—TRANS.

In his Larger Catechism, Dr. Luther explains and establishes, from the Word of God, this same view more fully, where it is thus written: "*What then is the Sacrament of the Altar?* Ans.—*It is the true body and blood of Christ our Lord, in and with bread and wine, commanded through the words of Christ, for us Christians to eat and to drink.*" And afterwards he declares: "It is the word, I say, that makes and distinguishes this sacrament, so that it is not mere bread and wine, but is, and is called, the body and blood of Christ." And directly afterwards he says: "By this word you can strengthen your conscience, and say: 'If a hundred thousand devils, together with all the fanatics advance, exclaiming: How can bread and wine be the body and blood of Christ, I still know that all these spirits and the learned altogether, are not as wise as the Divine Majesty.' Now, here occur the words of Christ: 'Take, eat, this is my body; drink ye all of this, this is the new testament in my blood.' To these words we constantly adhere, and we shall see who may presume to overcome Christ, and to use these words otherwise than he has declared them. It is true indeed, if you separate the words from it, or view it apart from the words, there remains nothing but mere bread and wine; but if the words remain with the bread and wine, as they should and must, this sacrament is, agreeably to the words themselves, the true body and blood of Christ. For, as the mouth of Christ speaks and declares, so it is, inasmuch as he can neither lie nor deceive.

"Hence it is easy to reply to the various questions, about which many are now solicitous; for instance—whether a wicked priest may handle and administer the Sacrament,—and the like. For here we conclude and assert: Even if a knave receives or administers the Sacrament, he receives the right Sacrament, that is, the body and blood of Christ, as well as he who partakes of it in the most reverential and worthy manner; for it is founded, not upon human sanctity, but upon the Word of God; and as no saint on earth, yea, no angel in heaven, can make bread and wine the body and blood of Christ; so likewise no one can alter or change it, even if the Sacrament is misused.

"The words, through which it became a sacrament, and through which it was instituted, do not become false on account of the unworthiness or unbelief of the person. For he does not say, If you believe or are worthy, you have my body and blood; but, *Take, eat, and drink, this is my body and blood.* Again, *do this*, (namely, this which I now do, institute, give, and command you to take,) which is as much as to say: Thank God whether you be worthy or unworthy, you here have Christ's body and blood by virtue of these words which come to

the bread and the wine. Mark this, and retain it well; for upon these words depend our grounds, our protection, and defence against all the errors and seductions which have arisen, and which may yet arise."

Thus far we have recited the words of the Larger Catechism, in which the true presence of the body and blood of Christ, in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is confirmed from the Word of God; and this is understood, not of the believing and worthy alone, but of the unbelieving and the unworthy also.

But inasmuch as this highly enlightened man saw in spirit that, after his death, some would endeavor to render him suspected of having receded from the doctrine just mentioned, and from other Christian articles, he subjoined to his Larger Confession the following protestation:

"Whilst I behold faction and error increase as time advances, whilst I see no cessation of the raging and raving of Satan; lest therefore, during my life, or after my death, some might hereafter conceal their device under my name, and fraudulently employ my writings to establish their errors, as the Sacramentarians and the Anabaptists now begin to do, I shall by this instrument of writing, profess my faith on all points before God and all the world. And in this faith, by the help of God, I intend to persevere until death, and, in it, to depart from this world, and to appear before the judgment-seat of our Lord Jesus Christ; and if, after my death, any one should say: 'If Dr. Luther lived now, he would teach and believe differently concerning this article or those; for he did not consider such sufficiently;' in opposition to this, I say now as then, and then as now, that by the grace of God I have most diligently considered all these articles, and compared them again and again with the Scriptures, and would as warmly defend these as I have now defended the Sacrament of the Altar. I am not intoxicated, nor inconsiderate; I know what I affirm; I feel too what an interest I have in the appearing of Jesus Christ in the last judgment. Therefore, let no one think that I am jesting or trifling; I am sincere; for by the grace of God, I well know Satan; if he can pervert and distort the Word of God, what shall he not do with my words, or those of other men?"

After this protestation, among other articles, Luther, of blessed memory, sets forth this also: "Even thus I declare," says he, "and confess too, concerning the Sacrament of the Altar, that therein the body and blood are truly eaten and drunk, in the bread and wine, orally, although the priest who administers, or those who receive the same, believe not, or otherwise misuse the Sacrament;—for the sacrament of the Lord's Supper depends, not upon the belief or unbelief of man,

but upon the word and institution of God ;—unless it were in consequence of their having first changed the word and institution of God perhaps, and explained them otherwise than they ought, even as the present enemies of this sacrament do. These, doubtless, have nothing but bread and wine in this Supper, because they have neither the word nor the instituted order of God, but have perverted and changed the same according to their own conceits.”*

And Dr. Luther, who certainly understood the true and proper meaning of the Augsburg Confession, rather than others, and constantly adhered to it and defended it, till the end of his life, in his last confession, a little before his death, confessed his faith concerning this article, with great zeal, and repeated it in the following words,† where he thus writes : “ I reckon all those in the same number, that is, as sacramentarians and fanatics—for such they are—who will not believe that the bread of the Lord in the Supper is his true natural body, which the ungodly or Judas, as well as St. Peter and all other saints, received orally ; whoever, I say, will not believe this, should let me alone, and not expect to hold fellowship with me ; and to this principle I must adhere.”

From this exposition, but more especially from Dr. Luther's explanation, who is the principal divine of the Augsburg Confession, every intelligent person, who loves truth and peace, can perceive with certainty what has always been the proper meaning and sense of the Augsburg Confession concerning this article.

For besides the expressions of Christ and St. Paul, (by which they assert that the bread in the Sacrament is the body of Christ, or the communion of the body of Christ,) the expressions, *under the bread, with the bread, in the bread*, have been used for the purpose of rejecting the Popish doctrine of transubstantiation, and for the purpose of indicating the sacramental union of the unchanged essence of the bread and of the body of Christ ; even as the expression, “ The WORD was made flesh,” John 1, 14, is sometimes repeated and explained by the equivalent forms, “ The WORD dwelt among us,” “ In Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” “ God was with him,” “ God was in Christ ;” Col. 2, 9 ; Acts 10, 38 ; 2 Cor. 5, 19 ; showing, namely, that the divine essence is not changed into the human nature, but that the two unchanged natures are personally united. And indeed, many eminent ancient teachers, Justin, Cyprian, Augustine, Leo, Gelasius, Chrysostom, and others, employ even this similitude (concerning the person of Christ) in explaining the words of the testament of Christ, “ This is my body.” For they teach that, as in Christ, there are two different

* Tom. II., Wittemb., German, fol. 243-252.

† Ibid.

unchanged natures united inseparably, so in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, the two substances, the natural bread, and the true natural body of Christ, are together present here on earth in the instituted administration of this sacrament. Yet this union of the body and blood of Christ with the bread and the wine, is not a personal union like that of the two natures in Christ, but it is a sacramental union, as Dr. Luther and our divines term it elsewhere, and in the aforementioned Articles of Agreement, composed A. D. 1536. By this they wish to indicate, that, even if they use also these forms, *in pane, sub pane, cum pane*, that is, these different modes of expression, *in the bread, under the bread, with the bread*, they nevertheless receive the words of Christ properly, as they read and understood this proposition, that is, the words of the testament of Christ, (*Hoc est corpus meum*),—*This is my body*,—by no means figuratively, even as Justin says: "This we receive not as ordinary bread and drink; but even as Jesus Christ our Savior was made flesh through the Word of God, and had flesh and blood on account of our salvation: so also we believe, that the food blessed by him through the word and prayer, is the body and blood of the Lord Jesus Christ." And Dr. Luther, in his Larger, and especially in his last Confession, concerning the Lord's Supper, defended with great earnestness and zeal, precisely the form of expression which Christ used in celebrating the first sacrament of the Lord's Supper.

Inasmuch, then, as Dr. Luther must be regarded as the most eminent teacher of the churches which adopt the Augsburg Confession, and as his whole doctrine in a compendious form, was comprehended in the oft-mentioned Augsburg Confession, delivered to the emperor Charles V.; the proper sense and meaning of said Augsburg Confession, cannot be drawn from any other man's writing, more accurately and certainly, than from the didactic and polemic writings of Dr. Luther.

And indeed, this sense or meaning just mentioned, is founded upon the firm, immovable, indubitable, and only rock of truth, namely, the words of the institution, recited in the divine Word; and it was thus understood, taught, and propagated by the holy Evangelists and Apostles, and their disciples and hearers.

For our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, concerning whom, as our only teacher, this solemn command: "Hear ye him," Matt. 17, 5, was given from heaven to all persons, is not a mere man or angel, and is not only true, wise, and mighty, but is also the eternal truth and wisdom, and Almighty God; who knows full well *what* and *how* he ought to speak, and is able effectually to accomplish, and to bring into operation, all those things which he declares and promises, as

he says: "Heaven and earth shall pass away; but my words shall not pass away," Luke 21, 33; again, "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Matt. 28, 18.

Now, this true, almighty Lord, our Creator and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, after the last Supper, when he commenced his bitter sufferings and death for our sins, on that last, sorrowful night, pronounced with due consideration and great solemnity, these words in the institution of this most august sacrament, which was to be received until the end of the world with great reverence and obedience, and which was to be a perpetual memorial of his bitter passion and death, and of all his benefits, a sealing of the new testament, a consolation for afflicted hearts, and a continual bond and union of Christians with Christ, their Head, and among themselves—these words, (we repeat) where he ordained and instituted this holy Supper, he spoke concerning the consecrated and offered bread:—*Take and eat, this is my body which is given for you*; and these, concerning the cup or the wine: *This is my blood of the new testament, which is shed for you for the remission of sins*.

Hence, we are under obligation not to interpret these words of this eternal, true, and almighty Son of God, our Lord, our Creator and Redeemer, Jesus Christ, as figurative, tropical, or strange expressions, and explain them so that they may appear conformable to our reason; but rather to receive these words as they read, in their proper and clear sense, with simple faith and due obedience; and we should not permit ourselves to be turned aside from them by any objections or human contradictions, derived from the reason of man, however agreeable they may appear to our reason.

Although Abraham, when he heard the words of God concerning the sacrifice of his son, had reason indeed to question whether these words should be understood literally, or whether they might not admit of some other more tolerable or some milder interpretation, since they plainly appeared to be at variance, not only with all reason and the divine and natural law, but also with the eminent article of faith, concerning Christ, the promised seed, who should be born of Isaac; nevertheless, as on a previous occasion, when the promise concerning the blessed seed of Isaac was given to him, (although it seemed impossible to his reason,) he gave God the praise of truth, and with the greatest confidence concluded and believed, that God is able to perform whatever he promises: so in this instance he understands and believes the word and command of God in their simple, and literal sense, and commits the matter to the omnipotence and wisdom of God, knowing that he has more ways and means to fulfil the

promise concerning the seed of Isaac, than he himself can comprehend with his blind reason.

In this manner, we also should with all humility and obedience simply *believe* the distinct, immutable, clear, and solemn words and command of our Creator and Redeemer, without any doubt or disputing in regard to the mode in which they may accord with our reason, or be possible. For *the Lord* has uttered these words, who himself is infinite wisdom and truth, and can most assuredly execute and accomplish all that he promises.

Now, all the circumstances of the institution of the holy Supper, show that these words of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ, which are simple, distinct, clear, immutable, and indubitable in themselves, can and should be understood not otherwise than in their usual, proper, and ordinary sense. For since Christ gives this command at table during the Supper, there can indeed be no doubt, that he speaks concerning true natural bread, and concerning natural wine, and also concerning oral eating and drinking; so that in the word *bread* there can be no metaphor,—that is, change of meaning,—as if the body of Christ were a spiritual bread, or a spiritual food for the soul. And Christ himself carefully shows that in the word *body*, there is no metonymy, that is, that there is likewise no change of meaning, and that he speaks, not concerning a sign of his body, or concerning a symbol, or a figurative body, or concerning the virtue of his body, and the benefits which he won for us by the offering of his body; for he speaks of his true, essential, or substantial, body, which he gave unto death for us, and of his true, essential blood, which he shed upon the cross for us, for the remission of sins.

Now, there is no interpreter of the words of Jesus Christ, so faithful and able as Christ, the Lord, himself, who best understands his own words, and his own sentiment, and meaning, and is most wise and intelligent in explaining them; who here in setting forth his last will and testament, and perpetual covenant and union, uses, not figurative words, but direct, simple, unambiguous, and clear words, as it is the case elsewhere in all articles of faith, and in all other covenants and signs of grace, or in the institution of sacraments, (as in the instance of circumcision, or in the various sacrifices in the Old Testament, and in the institution of holy Baptism;) and in order that no misunderstanding might arise, he sufficiently explains his meaning in reference to the Lord's Supper, by these words—*given for you, shed for you*; and when his disciples received the words in their simple and proper meaning, he permitted them to retain it, and commanded them thus to teach all nations to observe what he commanded them, that is, the Apostles.

Wherefore, the three Evangelists, Matthew, (Matt. 26, 26,) Mark, (Mark 14, 22,) Luke, (Luke 22, 19,) as well as St. Paul, who received the same from Christ himself, after his ascension to heaven, (1 Cor. 11, 23, 24,) unanimously, and in the same words and syllables, repeat these clear, plain, immutable, and true words of Christ, *this is my body*, altogether in one and the same manner, concerning the consecrated and administered bread, without any trope, figure, or variation. There is no doubt, therefore, that, concerning the other part of this sacrament, these words of Luke and Paul: *This cup is the new testament in my blood*, can have no other meaning than that which St. Matthew and Mark give, *this* (namely, this which you drink out of the cup orally) *is my blood of the new testament*, by which I establish, seal, and confirm unto you children of men, this my testament, and new covenant, namely, the remission of sins.

And, also, the repetition, confirmation, and explanation of the words of Christ, which St. Paul, (1 Cor. 10, 16,) sets forth, are to be considered with all diligence and earnestness as an especial, clear testimony of the true, essential presence and distribution of the body and blood of Christ, in the Lord's Supper, where he thus writes: "The cup of blessing which we bless, is it not the communion of the blood of Christ? The bread which we break, is it not the communion of the body of Christ?" From these words we perceive clearly, that not only the cup, which Christ blessed in the first Supper, and not only the bread which Christ broke and distributed, but *that* bread also which *we* break, and that cup which *we* bless, are the communion of the body and of the blood of Christ; so that all those who eat this bread, and drink of this cup, truly receive, and partake of the true body and blood of Christ. For if the body of Christ were not truly and essentially, but only according to its virtue and operation, present and received, the bread should be called a communion, not of the body, but of the Spirit, virtue, and benefits of Christ, as the Apology argues and concludes. And if Paul spoke only concerning the spiritual communion of the body of Christ through faith, as the Sacramentarians pervert this passage, he would not say, that the *bread*, but the spirit or faith is the communion of the body of Christ. But now the Apostle affirms, that the *bread* is the communion of the body of Christ, namely, that all who receive the blessed bread, become partakers of the body of Christ too; consequently, he must speak, not of a spiritual, but of a sacramental or oral partaking of the body of Christ, which is common both to pious and to wicked or nominal Christians.

The occasion and the circumstances of this whole discourse of St. Paul, confirm this view. For those who ate of the offerings made

to an idol, and had communion with the heathen sacrifices to devils, (1 Cor. 10, 20, 21,) and nevertheless also came to the table of the Lord, and became partakers of the body and blood of Christ, Paul detests from acts so criminal, and admonishes, lest they should receive the body and blood of Christ to their own judgment and condemnation. For, since all who are partakers of the blessed and broken bread in the Supper, have communion with the body of Christ also, St. Paul cannot speak of the spiritual communion with Christ, which no one can abuse, and in reference to which no one needs a warning.

Wherefore, our venerable Fathers and predecessors, as Luther and other pure teachers of the Augsburg Confession, explain this declaration of Paul, with such words that it accords most fully with the words of Christ, when they thus write: "The bread which we break, is the distributed body of Christ, or the common body of Christ, distributed to those who receive the broken bread."

To this simple and well-founded explanation of that glorious testimony, 1 Cor. 10, 16, we adhere unanimously, and we have reason to be surprised that some, with great audacity, can now quote this passage, which they themselves had opposed to the Sacramentarians as the foundation of their error, that, namely, in the Lord's Supper the body of Christ is only spiritually received; for they say: *Panis est communicatio corporis Christi, hoc est, id, quo fit societas cum corpore Christi (quod est Ecclesia) seu est medium, per quod fideles unimus Christo, sicut verbum Evangelii fide apprehensum, est medium, per quod Christo spiritualiter unimur, et corpori Christi, quod est Ecclesia, inserimur*, which being translated is as follows: "The bread is the communion of the body of Christ, that is, it is that through which we have communion with the body of Christ, (which is the church,) or, it is the medium, through which we, believers, are united with Christ, even as the word of the Gospel, when it is apprehended by faith, is a medium, through which we are spiritually united with Christ, and incorporated with the body of Christ, which is the church."

For, the fact that not only godly, pious, and believing Christians, but unworthy and ungodly hypocrites—persons, for instance, like Judas and his associates, who have no spiritual communion with Christ, and approach the table of the Lord, without true repentance and conversion to God—also receive the true body and blood of Christ in the Sacrament orally, and by their unworthy eating and drinking commit a grievous sin against the body and blood of Christ—this fact St. Paul expressly teaches, 1 Cor. 11, 27: "Whosoever shall eat this bread, and drink this cup of the Lord, unworthily," commits sin not

only against the bread and the wine, not only against signs, or symbols and figures of the body and blood, but is "guilty of the body and blood of the Lord" Jesus Christ, whom, being present here in this sacrament, he dishonors and insults like the Jews, who actually and really sinned fearfully against the body of Christ, and put him to death. For in this manner the ancient Christian Fathers and teachers of the church unanimously understood and explained this declaration of St. Paul.

Now, there are two modes of partaking of the flesh of Christ; the one is *spiritual*, concerning which Christ, John 6, 54, especially speaks, and which is effected only by the Spirit and by faith, in the preaching and in the meditation on the Gospel, even as the same is effected in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper; and this spiritual eating is useful and salutary in itself, and necessary to all Christians, at all times, for salvation; without which spiritual partaking, even that sacramental or oral eating in the Lord's Supper, is not only unprofitable, but also injurious and culpable.

But this spiritual eating is nothing else but *faith*, that is, to hear the Word of God, (in which is offered unto us Christ,—true God and man,—with all the blessings which he obtained for us with his body given unto death for us, and with his blood shed for us—namely, the grace of God, remission of sins, righteousness, and eternal life,) to embrace the same with faith, to apply it to ourselves, to rely firmly and with perfect confidence and assurance upon this consolation that we have a gracious God and eternal life for the sake of the Lord Jesus Christ, and to support ourselves by it in every time of need and in all temptations.

The other mode of partaking of the body of Christ is *oral* or *sacramental*, when in the Lord's Supper, the true, essential body and blood of Christ are received and partaken of orally, by all who eat and drink the consecrated bread and wine, in this holy sacrament. Believers receive the body and blood of Christ as a sure pledge and confirmation that their sins are certainly remitted, and that Christ dwells and is efficacious in them; unbelievers, also, receive the body and blood of Christ orally, but to their judgment and condemnation. This the words of Christ, which he used in the institution of this sacrament, expressly teach. For, at the table and during the Supper, he administered natural bread and natural wine to his disciples, which he calls his true body and his true blood, and says at the same time: *Eat*, and *drink*. Hence this command of Christ, in consequence of the circumstances connected with it, can be understood not otherwise than as relating to an oral eating and drinking, not in a gross, carnal,

Capernaïtic,* but in a supernatural, incomprehensible manner. Besides this oral eating, Christ, in his other command, afterwards requires another and spiritual eating, when he further says: “This do in remembrance of me;” for here he demands faith.

Wherefore, according to these words of the institution of Christ, and the explanation of St. Paul, all the ancient Christian teachers expressly, and in harmony with the universal, holy, Christian church, uniformly taught, that the body of Christ is received not only spiritually, by faith—which also takes place independently of the use of the Sacrament—but also orally, not only by believing and pious Christians, but also by the unworthy, the unbelieving, the wicked, and the hypocritical, who only bear the Christian name. But it would take up too much space to transcribe the testimony of these ancient teachers; we shall therefore, for the sake of brevity, refer the Christian reader to the writings of our theologians, in which these are copiously treated.

Hence it is manifest, with what injustice and virulence the Sacramentarians† deride Christ the Lord, St. Paul, and the whole church, who have called this oral eating, and the eating on the part of the unworthy, *duos pilos caudæ equinæ, et commentum, cujus vel ipsum Satanam pudeat*, and the doctrine concerning the Majesty of Christ, *excrementum Satanae, quo diabolus sibi ipsi et hominibus illudat*; which expressions are so horrible, that decency forbids a pious Christian to translate them.

But it should be carefully explained who the unworthy guests of this holy Supper are; they are those who approach this sacrament, without true repentance and sorrow for their sins, without true faith, and without a good intention to amend their lives, and who by their unworthy oral eating of the body of Christ, incur judgment, that is, temporal and eternal chastisements, and become guilty of the body and blood of Christ.

But the worthy guests are Christians, weak indeed in faith, faint-hearted and afflicted, who, on account of the magnitude and the multitude of their sins, are alarmed in their hearts, who, in view of their great impurity, judge themselves unworthy of this noble treasure and of the benefits of Christ, who feel and deplore their weakness of faith, and desire from their hearts to be able to serve God with a stronger, and more joyful faith, and with pure obedience; these are the truly

* *Capernaïtic*.—This word alludes to the gross, physical sense in which the people of Capernaum, John 6, 52–59, understood the words of the Savior.—[TRANS.]

† Theodore Beza, and others.

worthy guests, for whom this most august sacrament was chiefly instituted and ordained. For thus Christ most benignly invites every one, saying: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. 11, 28. Again, "They that be whole need not a physician, but they that are sick," Matt. 9, 12. Again, "My strength is made perfect in weakness," 2 Cor. 12, 9. Again, "Him that is weak in the faith, receive ye;—for God hath received him," Rom. 14, 1, 3. "For whosoever believeth in the Son of God," he it with a weak or strong faith, "hath everlasting life," John 3, 16.

This worthiness consists, not in a greater or a less weakness or strength of faith, but in the merits of Christ, in which the sorrowing father, who was weak in faith, and who is mentioned in the 9th ch. and 24th verse of Mark, shared, as well as Abraham, Paul, and others, who had a joyful and a strong faith.

Let these statements suffice in reference to the true presence and the twofold partaking of the body and blood of Christ, which are enjoyed by the worthy through faith *spiritually*, and *orally* both by the worthy and unworthy.

But inasmuch as a misunderstanding and a division occurred among some teachers of the Augsburg Confession also concerning the consecration, and concerning the general rule, that *nothing is a sacrament, apart from the instituted use*, we have likewise expressed our views in friendship and harmony, concerning this matter, in the following manner, namely:—That the true presence of the body and blood in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, is not effected by the word or work of any man, whether it be the merit or utterance of the minister, or the eating and drinking, or the faith of the communicants; but this presence must be ascribed wholly to the almighty power of God and to the Word, institution, and ordaining of our Lord Jesus Christ alone.

For the true and omnipotent words of Jesus Christ, which he pronounced at the first institution, were efficacious not only in that first Supper, but their power, virtue, and efficacy still endure and prevail; so that in all places, where this Supper is celebrated according to the institution of Christ, and where his words are used, by virtue and power of these words which Christ pronounced at the first Supper, the body and blood of Christ are truly present, administered, and received. For, where his institution is observed, and his words are recited in the consecration of the bread and the cup, and this blessed bread and cup are administered through these recited words, Christ himself is still efficacious, by virtue of the first institution, through his words, which he wishes to be repeated here;

✓
P. 67
67

✓
p. 68

as Chrysostom,* in his sermon concerning the Passion, asserts: "Christ himself prepares this table, and blesses it. For no man makes the exhibited bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ, but Christ himself, who was crucified for us. These words are pronounced by the mouth of the priest, but by the power and grace of God, through these words, which he speaks—*This is my body*—the elements set apart in this Supper, are blessed. And as these words, Gen. 1, 28: 'Be fruitful, and multiply, and replenish the earth,' were declared only once, but are always efficacious in nature, so that men increase and multiply, so also these—*this is my body, this is my blood*—were once declared, but are efficacious till this day, and will be the same until his coming, so that his true body and blood shall be present in this Supper of the church."

Luther, (*Tom. 6, Jen.*, fol. 99,) writes thus: "This command and institution of Christ, enable us to administer and receive, not mere bread and wine, but his body and blood, as his words declare: *This is my body, &c., this is my blood, &c.* So that not our work or speaking, but the command and ordaining of Christ, make the bread the body, and the wine the blood, from the beginning of the first Supper of the Lord, until the end of the world; but they are daily administered through our service and office."

Again, (*Tom. 3, Jen.*, fol. 446,) he says: "Thus also here, even if I were to pronounce these words concerning all bread, *this is the body of Christ*, it is true that nothing would be effected by it; but if, in the administration of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, we say, according to his command and institution: *this is my body*, then it is his body, not on account of our declaration, or, because the utterance of these words has this efficacy, but on account of his command, because he commanded us to pronounce these words, and to do this, and thus connected his command and his act with our declaration."

Now, the words of the institution, in the administration of this holy Supper, should be publicly recited, or chanted before the congregation, in a clear and distinct manner, and they should by no means be omitted; so that due obedience may be rendered to the command of Christ, who says: *this do*; and that by the words of Christ, the faith of the hearers may be awakened, strengthened, and assured concerning the essence and the fruit of this sacrament,—concerning the presence of the body and blood of Christ, concerning the remission of sins, and all the benefits which were obtained for us

* *De proditiōe Judæ. hom. 7, de Passione*, (hom. 82, in Matth.)

through the death of Christ and the shedding of his blood, and which are given unto us in the testament of Christ;—and also that the elements of bread and wine may be sanctified or blessed to this holy use, so that with these the body and blood of Christ may be administered unto us to eat and to drink; as Paul says: *the cup of blessing which we bless, &c.*, 1 Cor. 10, 16, 17; which blessing, indeed, comes to pass only through the repetition and recitation of the words of the institution.

But this blessing alone, or the recitation of the words of the institution of Christ constitute no sacrament, if the whole *action* of this Supper, as it was ordered by Christ, be not observed; if, for instance, the consecrated bread be not administered, received, and enjoyed, but be locked up, sacrificed, or borne about. But the command of Christ, *this do*, must be observed entire and inviolate, which comprises the whole *action* or administration of this sacrament; namely, in a Christian assembly, to take bread and wine, to bless, to administer, and to receive them, that is, to eat and to drink, and at the same time to show the death of the Lord, as also St. Paul presents before our eyes the whole action of breaking bread, or of distributing it and receiving it, 1 Cor. 10, 16, 17.

In order to preserve this true and Christian doctrine concerning this holy Supper, and also to avoid and abolish the various idolatrous abuses and perversions of this testament of Christ, this useful rule or standard has been derived from the words of the institution: *Nihil habet rationem sacramenti extra usum a Christo institutum, or extra actionem divinitus institutam*; that is, if the institution of Christ, as he ordained it, be not observed, it is no sacrament. This rule is by no means to be rejected; for it may be observed in the church of God with advantage, and it should be retained. And here the word *usus* or *actio*, that is, *use* or *action*, does not signify faith particularly, nor the oral eating alone, but the whole external, visible transaction as instituted by Christ, of the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, namely, the *consecration*, or the words of the institution, the *distribution*, and *reception* or the oral participation of the consecrated bread and wine, the body and blood of Christ; apart from which use, when in the Papistical mass the bread is not distributed, but sacrificed, or locked up, borne about, and set forth to be adored, it is not to be regarded as a sacrament, even as the water in Baptism, when it is used to consecrate bells, or to cure the leprosy, or is set forth to be adored, is no sacrament or baptism. For, in opposition to such Papistical abuses, this rule was originally established, and it is explained by Dr. Luther, *Tom. 4, Jen. fol. 597.*

But, besides, it should not be forgotten that the Sacramentarians craftily and maliciously pervert this useful and necessary rule, for the purpose of denying the true, essential presence and the oral participation of the body of Christ, which takes place here on earth, in the case alike of the worthy and the unworthy; and interpret it as alluding to the *usus fidei*, that is, to the spiritual and internal use of faith, as if it were no sacrament to the unworthy, and as if the participation of the body of Christ occurred only spiritually through faith, or as if faith causes the body of Christ to be present in this holy Supper, and that, therefore, unworthy persons and unbelieving hypocrites receive not the present body of Christ.

Now, our faith does not constitute this sacrament, but the most sure word and institution of our Almighty God and Savior, Jesus Christ alone, constitute it; for these are ever efficacious, and remain in the Christian community, and are not abrogated or rendered ineffectual by the worthiness or unworthiness of the minister, or by the unbelief of the recipient. Even as the Gospel, although the ungodly hearer believe it not, nevertheless remains the true Gospel, only it is not effectual in the unbelieving unto salvation: so, whether those who receive this sacrament, believe or do not believe, Christ nevertheless remains true in his words, in which he says, *Take, eat, this is my body*; and this he effects, not through our faith, but through his omnipotence.

Wherefore, those commit a pernicious and shameful error, who, by a crafty perversion of this common rule, ascribe more to our faith,—as if it alone caused the body of Christ to be present, and received it,—than to the omnipotence of our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ.

The various imaginary grounds and futile objections of the Sacramentarians, which they produce concerning the essential and natural properties of a human body, concerning the ascension of Christ to heaven, concerning his departure from this world, and the like, are all completely and amply refuted by Dr. Luther, with arguments derived from the Word of God, in his polemic writings. We shall, therefore, for the sake of brevity, refer the Christian reader to these writings. But among these, those to which we chiefly have reference, are his publications against the Heavenly Prophets, (as they were then called,) his treatise entitled: That these words, *This is my body*, &c., still remain unshaken; his Larger and Smaller Confessions concerning the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and others of his writings. For, since the death of Dr. Luther, no new arguments have been produced by these fanatical spirits.

But the following are the reasons for which we neither will, nor can, nor should permit ourselves to be led away, by any human wisdom or opinions,—no matter what gloss or authority they may assume,—from the simple, perspicuous, and clear meaning of the words and testament of Christ, to a foreign meaning, deviating from the express words of Christ; but we shall rather, in the manner stated above, simply understand and believe them; and this ground, ever since this article became a subject of controversy we have maintained, agreeably to the declarations of Dr. Luther, directed at the beginning, against the Sacramentarians, in the following terms: * “The grounds upon which I stand with respect to this matter, are these:

1. The first is this article of our faith:—Jesus Christ is essential, natural, true, and perfect God and man, in one person, unseparated and undivided.

2. The second, that the right hand of God is every where.

3. The third, that the Word of God is neither false, nor deceptive.

4. The fourth, that God knows and has in his power various ways, in which he can at any time be present in a place, and not only the one, about which the fanatics trifle, and which philosophers call *local*.

Again, the one body of Christ has three different ways, or a triple mode of being in any place.

First, *the comprehensible and corporeal mode*, when he went about corporeally on earth, where he occupied, and took up space, according to his magnitude. This mode he is still able to use, when he pleases, as he did after his resurrection, and as he will on the last day; as Paul declares: ‘Which in his times he shall show, who is the blessed and only Potentate,’ &c., 1 Tim. 6, 15. And Col. 3, 4: ‘When Christ, who is our life, shall appear,’ &c. In this mode he is not in God, nor with the Father, nor in heaven, as fanatical men dream, for God is not a corporeal room or space. And to this mode, the passages of Scripture refer, which the fanatics introduce, namely, that Christ departed from the world, and went to the Father.

Second, *the incomprehensible, spiritual mode*, in which he is not circumscribed in space, but penetrates through all creatures, where he pleases, as my vision (to use this rude similitude) passes through air, light, or water, and yet neither takes up, nor makes room; as sound passes through air or water, or planks and walls, and yet does not take up or make room; again, as light and heat pass through air, water, glass, crystals, and the like, and yet neither make nor

* In the Larger Confession concerning the Lord's Supper.

require room, and many similar examples could be mentioned. This method he employed when he arose from the sealed sepulchre, and when he passed through the closed doors, and when he is in the bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, and as it is believed, when he was born of his mother.

Third, *the divine and heavenly mode*, in which he is one person with God, and according to which all creatures must undoubtedly be far more easily penetrated and be nearer to him, than they are according to the second mode. For if, according to this second mode, he can be in and with creatures in such a way, that they neither feel, nor touch, nor measure, nor comprehend him; how much more wonderfully is he in all creatures according to this exalted third mode! so that they neither measure nor comprehend him, but much rather that he has them present before him, measures and comprehends them. For this mode of the presence of Christ, derived from the personal union with God, you must place far, very far beyond creatures, as far as God is above them; again, as deep and as near in all creatures, as God is in them; for he is an inseparable person with God; where God is, there he must also be,—or our faith is false. But who can tell or imagine the manner in which this takes place? We well know that it is so, namely, that he is in God, that he is apart from all creatures, and that he is one person with God, but how it comes to pass, we know not; it is above nature and reason; yes, above all the angels in heaven; it is known and obvious to God alone. Since, then, it is unknown to us, and is nevertheless true, we should not deny his Word before we are able to prove with certainty, that the body of Christ can by no means be where God is, and that this mode of presence is false. It is incumbent upon the fanatics to prove this, but they will not attempt it.

Now, that God has and knows still other ways, according to which the body of Christ may be in any place, I will by no means deny; but I wished to show how dull and stupid the fanatics are, who attribute to the body of Christ not more than the first comprehensible mode of presence; although they are unable to prove that even this mode is contrary to our view. For I will in no way deny, that God may be able to accomplish so much that a body might be simultaneously present in many places, even in a corporeal and comprehensible manner. For who will prove, that this is impossible to God? Who has seen a limit to his power? The fanatics think indeed, that God cannot effect this; but who will believe their thoughts? By what kind of argument do they confirm these thoughts?" Thus far Luther.

From these words of Dr. Luther it is likewise manifest, in what sense the word *spiritual* is used in our churches concerning this matter. For, with the Sacramentarians, this word *spiritual* signifies nothing more than that spiritual communion, when by faith the truly believing are incorporated in spirit in Christ the Lord, and become true spiritual members of his body.

But when this word *spiritual* is used by Dr. Luther, or by ourselves in reference to this matter, we understand by it the spiritual, supernatural, heavenly mode, according to which Christ being present in the holy Supper, works not only consolation and life in the believing, but also judgment in the unbelieving. And by this word *spiritual* we reject those Capernaitic thoughts concerning the gross, carnal presence, with which our churches are charged by the Sacramentarians, notwithstanding all our public and frequent protestations. In this sense we wish the word *spiritual* to be understood, when we assert that, in the holy Supper, the body and blood of Christ are spiritually received, eaten, and drunk; for, although this participation takes place orally, yet the mode is spiritual.

Thus our faith in this article, concerning the true presence of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper, is built upon the *truth* and *omnipotence* of the true and omnipotent God, our Lord and Savior, Jesus Christ. These grounds are sufficiently strong and firm to strengthen and confirm our faith against all trials arising in consequence of this article, and, on the other hand, to refute and to overthrow all the objections and contradictions of the Sacramentarians, no matter how acceptable and evident to reason they may appear. And upon these grounds, a Christian mind can lean and depend, with confidence and security.

Accordingly, we reject and condemn with our hearts and our lips,—as false, dangerous, and seductive,—all errors adverse and repugnant to the doctrine which we have now laid down, and which is founded upon the Word of God; namely:

1. The Papistical *transubstantiation*, by which it is taught, that the consecrated or blessed bread and wine, in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, lose their substance and essence wholly and entirely, and are changed into the substance of the body and blood of Christ, so that only the mere form of bread and wine (or *accipentia sine subjecto*,) remains. And, as they think, under this form of the bread, (which, however, according to their opinion, is no longer bread, but has lost its natural essence,) the body of Christ is present, even apart from the administration of the Supper, when the bread is enclosed in a box (called the pyx,) or carried about as a spec-

tacle in order to be adored. For nothing can be a sacrament, apart from the command of God and the ordained use for which it was instituted by the Word of God, as above stated.

2. In like manner, we repudiate and condemn all other Papistical abuses of this sacrament; such as, the abomination of the sacrifice of the mass for the living and the dead.

3. Again, we condemn the practice of administering but one element or part of this sacrament to the laity, contrary to the express command and institution of Christ. And indeed, these and many other Papistical abuses are amply refuted by the Word of God, and by testimonies of the ancient churches, in the common Confession and Apology of our church, in the Smalcald Articles, and in other publications of our authors.

But since, in this treatise, we have designed chiefly to lay down our confession and declaration concerning the true presence of the body and blood of Christ alone, against the Sacramentarians, some of whom, under the name of the Augsburg Confession, impudently insinuate themselves into these churches, we shall also enumerate the errors of the Sacramentarians particularly in this place, for the purpose of admonishing our hearers, so that they may detect and avoid them.

Accordingly, we reject and condemn with our hearts and our lips, as false, dangerous, and seductive, all the opinions and doctrines of the Sacramentarians, which are inconsistent with, and adverse and repugnant to the doctrine stated above, and founded on the Word of God.

1. Namely, when they pretend, that the words of the institution are not to be received simply in their proper meaning as they read, concerning the true, essential presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, but that through tropes or figurative significations, they are to be explained in another, or new and foreign sense. And here we reject all such self-contradictory opinions of the Sacramentarians, no matter how multifarious and diverse they may be.

2. Again, we reject the doctrine by which the oral participation of the body and blood of Christ in the holy Supper, is denied, and by which, on the contrary, it is taught, that in this supper the body of Christ is received only spiritually, through faith, so that in this holy supper we receive with our lips nothing but mere bread and wine.

3. Likewise, when it is taught, that bread and wine in the Lord's Supper, are nothing more than signs by which Christians may be known to each other.

4. Or, that they are only symbols, figures, and representations of the far-absent body of Christ, in such a manner, that even as bread and wine are the external food of our bodies, so the absent body of Christ with his merits, is the spiritual food of our souls.

5. Or, that they are nothing more than signs and memorials of the absent body of Christ, through which signs, as through an external pledge, we are assured that faith, which turns itself away from the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, and ascends above all heavens, becomes there, indeed, a participant of the body and blood of Christ, as truly as we receive the external signs with our lips in the Lord's Supper; and that thus the assurance and confirmation of our faith in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, take place through the external signs, and not through the true and present body and blood of Christ, as administered to us.

6. Or, that in the holy Supper, the virtue, operation, and merit of the far-absent body of Christ, are administered unto faith alone, so that in this manner we become partakers of his absent body, and that, in the manner just stated, *unio sacramentalis*, or the sacramental union, is to be understood *de analogia signi et signati*, that is, from the analogy of a sign and the thing signified, namely, in as far as there is a similitude between the bread and wine, and the body and blood of Christ.

7. Or, that the body and blood of Christ are received and partaken of, not otherwise than spiritually, through faith.

8. Again, when it is taught, that Christ, in consequence of his ascension to heaven, is so contained and circumscribed with his body, in a certain place in heaven, that with it he neither can nor will be truly and essentially present with us in the holy Supper, which is celebrated here on earth according to the institution of Christ, but that he is as far, or distant from it, as heaven and earth are from each other; as some Sacramentarians, for the confirmation of their error, have wilfully perverted this text, Acts 3, 21: *Oportet Christum celum accipere*; that is, *It behooved Christ to receive the heaven*; and instead of this translation, they have rendered it; *Oportet Christum celo capi*; that is, *It behooved Christ to be received by or in the heaven, or to be circumscribed and contained in heaven*, so that he neither can nor will be with us on earth in any manner with his human nature.

9. Again, that Christ neither promised, nor could or would promise, or afford the true, essential presence of his body and blood in his holy Supper, since the nature and the properties of his assumed human nature, can neither bear nor admit of it.

10. Again, we reject the doctrine by which it is taught, that not the word and omnipotence of Christ alone, but faith causes the body of Christ to be present in the holy Supper. Hence, in the *action* of this Supper, the words of the institution are omitted by some. For, although the Papistical consecration, the efficacy of which was ascribed to the verbal rehearsal, which is the work of the priest, (as if this constituted a sacrament,) is justly reprehended and rejected; yet the words of the institution neither can nor should, by any means, be omitted in the action of this Supper, as was shown in the preceding explanation.

11. Again, we deny that believers should not seek the body of Christ in the bread and the wine of this supper, by virtue of the words of the institution of Christ, but that with their faith they are directed from the bread of this holy supper into heaven to the place where Christ the Lord is with his body, so that there they might partake of him.

12. We likewise reject the error by which it is taught, that the unbelieving and impenitent, (who only bear the title of Christians, but have not true, genuine, living, and saving faith,) receive not the body and blood of Christ in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, but bread and wine alone. And since only two kinds of guests are found at this heavenly banquet, namely, the worthy and the unworthy, we also reject that distinction which is made among the unworthy, by some who assert that ungodly epicures and mockers of the Word of God (who are in the outward communion of the church) receive not the body and blood of Christ unto judgment, in the use of the holy Supper, but bread and wine alone.

13. Thus too, when it is taught, that the worthiness consists not in true faith alone, but in a person's own preparation.

14. And likewise, when it is taught, that true believers also, who have and retain a genuine, true, and living faith, but are nevertheless deficient in their own preparation, can receive this sacrament unto judgment, as well as the unworthy guests.

15. Again, we reject the doctrine, that the elements, the visible *species*, or forms of the consecrated bread and wine, should be adored. But that Christ himself, true God and man, who is truly and essentially present in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in its legitimate use, should be adored in spirit and in truth, in all other places indeed, but especially where his congregation assemble, no one can or will deny, unless he be an Arian heretic.

16. We repudiate, moreover, and condemn all the over-curious, mocking, and blasphemous questions and expressions, which are em-

ployed in a gross, carnal, Capernaitic manner, concerning the supernatural, heavenly mysteries of this sacrament.

Other contrary and objectionable doctrines have been reprehended and rejected in the preceding explanation. These, for the sake of brevity, we shall not repeat here; and whatever other erroneous opinions worthy of condemnation there may be besides, can be easily perceived and named from the above explanation. For we reject and condemn all that is not consistent with, but contrary and repugnant to the doctrine which we have stated above, and which is well founded on the Word of God.

VIII. OF THE PERSON OF CHRIST.

A controversy likewise arose among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, concerning the *Person* of Christ; which, however, did not take its rise among them, but was originally occasioned by the Sacramentarians.

For, after Dr. Luther, in opposition to the Sacramentarians, maintained on substantial grounds, the true, essential presence of the body and blood of Christ, in the holy Supper, from the words of the institution, the objection was urged against him by the Zwinglians, that if the body of Christ is simultaneously present in heaven and on earth, in the Supper of the Lord, it cannot be a right, true, and human body; for that such majesty can be attributed to God only, but that the body of Christ is not capable of it.

Dr. Luther opposed and refuted this objection with great power, as his doctrinal and polemic writings concerning the holy Supper show, which we hereby acknowledge as well as his didactic writings; but, after his death, some theologians of the Augsburg Confession arose, who, though they did not indeed wish publicly and expressly to attach themselves to the Sacramentarians in the matter of the Lord's Supper, nevertheless introduced and employed the same grounds, concerning the person of Christ, by which the Sacramentarians undertook to deny the true, essential presence of the body and blood of Christ, in his supper; namely, that to the human nature in the person of Christ, nothing shall be ascribed that is above, or contrary to its natural, essential properties. And besides this, they assailed the doctrines of Dr. Luther, and of all those who adhere to the same as being conformable to the Word of God, with the charges urged against nearly all ancient, abominable heresies.

For the purpose of explaining this controversy in accordance with the Word of God, according to the analogy of our simple, Christian

faith, and by the grace of God, of entirely disposing of it, we state that our unanimous doctrine, faith, and confession, are the following :

We believe, teach, and confess, that, although the Son of God is from all eternity a distinct, and entire divine person, and thus true, essential, perfect God, with the Father and the Holy Ghost, he nevertheless, when the fulness of the time was come, assumed human nature also in the unity of his person, not in such a manner that there now were two persons or two Christs, but, that now Jesus Christ in one person, is, at the same time, true, eternal God, begotten of the Father from eternity, and a true man, born of the blessed virgin Mary ; as it is written, Rom. 9, 5: “Of whom, as concerning the flesh, Christ came, who is over all, God blessed for ever.”

We believe, teach, and confess, that now in this one undivided person of Christ, there are two distinct natures : the divine, which is from eternity, and the human, which in time was assumed in the unity of the person of the Son of God. And these two natures in the person of Christ are never either separated, or commingled with each other, nor is the one changed into the other ; but each one remains in its nature and essence, in the person of Christ to all eternity.

We likewise believe, teach, and confess, that, as the said two natures remain unmingled and unabolished in their nature and essence, so also that each one retains its natural, essential properties, and does not, to all eternity, lay them aside ; and that the essential properties of the one nature never become the essential properties of the other nature.

Consequently, we believe, teach, and confess, that, to be almighty, eternal, infinite, to be present in all places at the same time, naturally, that is, according to the property of that nature and its natural essence, of itself to be present, to know all things—are essential attributes of the divine nature, which never in eternity become the essential attributes of the human nature.

But again, to be a corporeal creature, to be flesh and blood, to be finite and circumscribed, to suffer, to die, to ascend, to descend, to move from place to place, to hunger, to thirst, to suffer from cold or heat, and the like, are attributes of the human nature, which never become the attributes of the divine nature.

We believe, teach, and confess also, that now each nature does not subsist of itself in Christ, since his Incarnation, so that each is, or constitutes a separate person ; but that these natures are so united as to constitute one person only, in which both the divine and the assumed human nature are at the same time, and personally subsist ; insomuch that now, since the Incarnation, not only the divine, but also the as-

sumed human nature, belong to the entire person of Christ; and that the person of Christ, or the incarnate Son of God, cannot be entire without his divinity, and in the same manner without his humanity. In Christ, therefore, there are not two distinct persons, but only one; although two distinct natures are found in him, unmingled in their natural essence and attributes.

We also believe, teach, and confess, that the assumed human nature in Christ, not only possesses and retains its original, essential properties, but that in addition, through the personal union with the divinity, and afterwards, by its glorification, it has been exalted to the right hand of Power, Might, and Majesty, above all that can be named, not only in this world, but in the world to come.

With respect to this Majesty, to which Christ has been exalted according to his humanity, he did not then first receive it when he arose from the dead and ascended to heaven, but when he was conceived in the womb, and became man, and when the divine and human natures were personally united with each other. But this personal union must not be so understood, as some incorrectly explain it, as if both natures, the divine and the human, were united with each other, as two boards are glued together; so that *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, they should have no communion at all with each other. For this was the error and heresy of Nestorius and Paul of Samosata, who, as Suidas and Theodorus, the Presbyter, (abbot of Raithu,) testify, taught and held: *δυο φύσεις ἀκοινωνήτους πρὸς ἑαυτὰς πανταπασιν, hoc est, Naturas omni modo incommunicabiles esse*; that is, that the natures have no communion at all with each other. By this false dogma the natures are separated from each other, and thus two Christs are constituted, the one of whom is Christ, and the other God, the Word dwelling in Christ.

For thus writes the presbyter Theodorus: *Paulus quidam iisdem quibus Manes temporibus, Samosatenus quidem ortu, sed Antiochiæ Syriæ Antistes, Dominum impie dixit nudum fuisse hominem, in quo Deus, Verbum, sicut et in singulis Prophetis habitavit, ac proinde duas naturas separatas et citra omnem prorsus inter se communionem in Christo esse, quasi alius sit Christus, alius Deus Verbum in ipso habitans.* That is:—Even in the days of Manes, the heretic, there was one by the name of Paul, a Samosatenian by birth indeed, but bishop of Antioch, in Syria, who taught impiously, that Christ the Lord was a mere man only, in whom God, the Word, dwelt, as he did in every Prophet. Hence he also maintained, that the divine and human natures are divided and separated from each other, and that in Christ they certainly have no commu-

nion with each other, even as if the one were Christ, and the other God, the WORD, dwelling in him.

In opposition to this condemnable heresy, the Christian church has ever believed and maintained with great simplicity, that the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, are so united as to have a real communication with each other. Yet the natures are not, therefore, mingled in one essence, but, as Dr. Luther writes, in one person. And on account of this personal union and communication, the ancient teachers of the church frequently, before and since the Council of Chalcedon, used the word *mixtio* (mingling) in an appropriate sense, and with due distinction. And for the confirmation of this fact, many testimonies, if it were necessary, could be produced from the writings of the Fathers,—which testimonies may also be found in various places in our writings. And indeed the ancient teachers explained the personal union and communication, by the similitude of body and soul, and of heated iron. For body and soul, as also fire and iron, have communication with each other, not merely nominally or verbally, but truly and really; and yet by this mode, no confusion or equalization of the natures is introduced, such as occurs when mead is made of honey and water, which is no more distinct water or honey, but a mixed drink. But here, with respect to the union of the divine and human natures in the person of Christ, the case is quite different; for, far different, far more exalted, and inexpressible, are the communication and union between the divine and human natures, in the person of Christ, on account of which union and communication, God is man, and man is God. Yet by this union and communication of natures, neither the natures themselves, nor their properties, are confounded; but each nature retains its essence and properties.

On account of this personal union, (which without this real communication of the natures, could neither exist nor be imagined,) not the bare human nature, the attribute of which is to suffer and to die, suffered for the sins of the whole world, but the Son of God himself suffered truly, yet according to his assumed human nature, and, according to our simple Christian Creed, he died truly, although the divine nature can neither suffer nor die. This point Dr. Luther has amply explained in his Larger Confession concerning the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, in opposition to the blasphemous *allæosis* of Zwinglius, who taught, that one nature must be taken and understood for the other, which Luther deprecates as a mask of the devil, that deserves the most severe condemnation.

Wherefore, the ancient teachers of the church used both these

words in connection, *κοινωνία* and *ἑνωσις*, *communion* or *communication* and *union*, in explaining this mystery, and explained one by the other: *Irenæus*, *lib. 4, cap. 37*; *Athanasius in Epistola ad Epic.*; *Hilarius de Trin. lib. 9*; *Basilus et Nyssenius in Theodoretō*; *Damascenus, lib. 3, cap. 19*.

In consequence of this personal union and communion of the divine and human natures in Christ, we also believe, teach, and confess, according to our simple, Christian faith, all that is said concerning the Majesty of Christ on the right hand of the almighty power of God, according to his humanity, and all that follows from it. All of which would be nothing, and could not exist, if this personal union and communication of the natures in the person of Christ, did not exist *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth.

On account of this personal union and communion of the natures, Mary, the blessed Virgin, brought forth, not a mere man, (human being,) but such a man (human being) as is truly the Son of God the Most High, as the angel (Luke 1, 32,) testifies. This Son of God, even in his mother's womb, demonstrated his divine majesty, in being born of a virgin, her virginity remaining inviolate; hence she was truly the mother of God, and yet remained a virgin.

By virtue of this personal union and communication, he also wrought all his miracles, and, at his pleasure, when and as he pleased, he manifested his divine majesty, and consequently not for the first time only after his resurrection and ascension, but also in his state of humiliation: for instance, at the marriage in Cana of Galilee, (John 2, 11;) again, among the learned, when he was twelve years of age, (Luke 2, 46;) again, in the garden, when at his word his enemies fell to the ground, (John 18, 6;) likewise at his death, when he died not simply as another man, but by and in his death, he conquered sin, death, Satan, hell, and eternal damnation,—a thing which the human nature alone could not have accomplished, without having been thus personally united and in communication with the divine nature.

From this union and communion of the natures, the human nature also derives its exaltation, after the resurrection from the dead, above all creatures in heaven and on earth; which is nothing else but that he laid aside the form of a servant, and yet, did not lay aside the human nature,—for this he retains to eternity,—and that he was placed in the full possession and use of the divine majesty, according to his assumed human nature. This majesty, however, he had immediately in his conception, even in his mother's womb; but, as the Apostle testifies, Phil. 2, 7, he “made himself of no reputation,”

and, as Dr. Luther explains it, in the state of his humiliation he held it concealed, and used it, not always, but when he pleased.

But now, he has ascended to heaven not merely as any other saint, but, as the Apostle, Eph. 4, 10, testifies, “he ascended up far above all heavens,” and also really “fills all things,” and reigns, not only as God, but also as man, every where present, from sea to sea, unto the ends of the earth, as the Prophets, Psalm 8, 1, 6; 93, 1; Zech. 9, 10, foretell concerning him, and as the Apostles, Mark, 16, 20, testify, that he every where worked with them, and confirmed the word with signs following. Yet these things did not occur in an earthly manner, but as Dr. Luther has explained, in a manner corresponding to the right hand of God, which is not a particular circumscribed *place* in heaven, (as the Sacramentarians pretend, without evidence from the Scripture,) but which is nothing else but the almighty power of God, which fills heaven and earth, and in the possession of which, Christ, according to his humanity, was placed *realiter*, that is, in deed and in truth, without confusion and equalization of the natures, in their essence and essential attributes. From this communicated power, therefore, Christ, according to the words of his testament, can be and is truly present with his body and blood in the holy sacrament of the Lord’s Supper, to which he directs us through his Word. This is possible to no other man, because no other man is united in this manner with the divine nature, and placed in this divine, omnipotent majesty and power, through and in the personal union of the two natures in Christ, as Jesus, the Son of Mary, is, in whom the divine and human natures are personally united with each other; so that in Christ “dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily,” Col. 2, 9. And in this personal union there is a communion of the natures so exalted, so intimate and inexpressible, that the angels desire to look into these things, and delight and rejoice in beholding them, as Peter, (1 Pet. 1, 12,) testifies. But all this shall hereafter be more fully explained in its order.

From the grounds which we have now mentioned, and in accordance with which we have explained the *personal union*, that is, the manner in which the divine and human natures in the person of Christ are united with each other, so that they not only have in common among themselves the names, but also have a communication, in deed and in truth, without any confusion or equalization of their essences, results also the doctrine *de communicatione idiomatum*; that is, concerning the true communication of the properties of those natures; concerning which matter we shall speak further hereafter.

For, since it is incontrovertibly true, *quod propria non egredian-*

tur sua subjecta, that is, that each nature retains its essential properties, and that these are not separated and transferred from the one nature to the other, as water is poured from one vessel into another; no communication of the properties could either be or subsist, if the aforementioned personal union or communication of the natures did not truly exist in the person of Christ. But this, next to the article concerning the holy Trinity, is the greatest mystery in heaven and on earth, as St. Paul, 1 Tim. 3, 16, testifies: "Without controversy, great is the mystery of godliness; God was manifest in the flesh." For, since the apostle Peter, 2 Pet. 1, 4, testifies in clear terms, that we also, in whom Christ dwells only by grace, on account of this high mystery in Christ, become "partakers of the divine nature;" what kind of a communication of the divine nature, then, must this be, concerning which the Apostle says, that *in Christ dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, Col. 2, 9; so that God and man are one person! But it is very important that this doctrine *de communicatione idiomatum*, that is, concerning the communication of the properties of both natures, should be treated and explained with due distinction. For the propositions or predication, which are used in speaking of the *person* of Christ, and of the natures and properties, are not all of one and the same kind or mode. And, if we speak concerning this matter without proper discrimination, an indistinctness involves this doctrine, and the inexperienced reader is easily confused. For these reasons, the following explanation should be carefully observed, which, to render it more plain and intelligible to the reader, may be comprehended in three leading articles.

First, since in Christ there are two distinct natures, unchanged and unconfounded in their natural essences and properties, and nevertheless, the two natures constitute but one person, that which is even the attribute of the one nature alone, is ascribed, not to that nature only, as separated, but to the whole person, who at the same time is God and man, whether called God or man.

But when we speak in this way, (in this class of predication,) it does not follow, that what is ascribed to the person, is at the same time the property of both natures; but it is distinctly explained according to which nature any thing is ascribed to the person. Thus the *Son of God was made of the seed of David, according to the flesh*, Rom. 1, 3. Again, *Christ was put to death in the flesh,—and he suffered in the flesh*, 1 Pet. 3, 18, and 4, 1.

But the secret and also the avowed Sacramentarians conceal their pernicious error under these words, in which it is asserted,

that what is the property of one nature, is ascribed to the whole person; and while they name the whole person indeed, they nevertheless understand by it merely the one nature, and exclude the other nature entirely, as if the mere human nature had suffered for us; as Dr. Luther, in his Larger Confession concerning the holy Supper, writes concerning the *allæosis*, of Zwinglius. We shall, therefore, introduce the words of Dr. Luther himself, for the purpose of securing the church of God in the best manner against this error; the following are his words: *

“Zwinglius calls that *allæosis*, which is said concerning the divinity of Christ, but which nevertheless belongs to the humanity, as, for instance, in the passage: ‘Ought not Christ to have suffered these things, and to enter into his glory?’ Luke 24, 26. Here Zwinglius pretends in an artful manner, that Christ is taken for the human nature. Beware, beware, I say, of this *allæosis*, it is the mask of the devil; for it will finally devise a Christ, according to whom I certainly would not wish to be a Christian: namely, that henceforth Christ neither is more nor accomplishes more by his suffering and his life, than a mere saint. For, if I were to believe that the human nature alone has suffered for me, Christ would be a Savior of little worth to me, and he himself indeed would need a Savior. In a word, it cannot be expressed what Satan devises with this *allæosis*.”

And a little afterwards he says: “If by chance that old sorceress and mistress, Reason, the grandmother of this *allæosis*, should exclaim: ‘The divinity can neither suffer nor die;’ then do you reply: ‘This is true, but nevertheless, since the divinity and humanity in Christ constitute one person, the Scriptures, on account of this personal union, attribute also to the divinity all that occurs to the humanity, and in turn, to the humanity all that occurs to the divinity;’ and thus it is in truth. For, this you must affirm:—This person (pointing to Christ) suffers, dies; now this person is true God, therefore, it is rightly said, the Son of God suffers. For, although the one part, (so to speak,) that is, the divinity, suffers not, yet the person, who is God, suffers, in the other part, that is, in the humanity; for, in truth, the Son of God was crucified for us; that is, the person which is God. For this person, this person, I say, was crucified, according to the human nature.”

And again, a little afterwards, he says: “If this *allæosis* should stand, as Zwinglius proposed it, Christ would necessarily be two persons, a divine and a human, since Zwinglius applies the passages of Scripture concerning suffering, to the human nature alone,

* Tom. 2, Wittemb., fol. 188.

and in every respect separates them from the divinity. For where the works are divided and separated, there the person itself must also be divided, because all the works and sufferings are attributed, not to the natures, but to the person. For it is the person that does and suffers all things; one thing, according to the one nature, another, according to the other nature. All this the learned well know. Wherefore, we regard Christ our Lord as God and man in one person, neither confounding (or mingling) the natures, nor dividing the person."

Again, in his work concerning Councils and the Church,* Dr. Luther says: "We Christians must know that if God is not also in the scales, and does not add his weight, we shall be found wanting. By this I mean, that if it could not be said that God died for us, but if it was only a man, we are lost; but if the death of God, and the fact that God died for us lie in the scale, it will descend, and we shall rise like a light weight; he can indeed also rise up again, or vacate this scale; but he could not be placed in this scale, unless he had become man like unto us; so that we may use the expressions: 'God died,' 'the passion of God,' 'the blood of God,' 'the death of God.' For God in his nature cannot die; but now, since God and man are united in one person, we may rightly say: 'the death of God,' namely, when the man dies, who is one with God, or one person with God." Thus far Luther.

From these words it is evident that it is an erroneous assertion, when it is said or written, that the aforementioned expressions, "God suffered," "God died," are only verbal predication, or mere words without any reality. For our simple Christian faith teaches that the Son of God, who became man, suffered and died for us, and redeemed us with his blood.

Secondly, with respect to the execution of the office of Christ, the person acts and operates, not in, with, through, or according to one nature alone, but in, with, according to, and through both natures; or, as the Council of Chalcedon says, one nature worketh in communication with the other, that which is appropriate to each one. Thus Christ is our Mediator, our Redeemer, our King, our High-Priest, our Head, our Shepherd, &c., not according to one nature alone, whether it be the divine or the human, but according to both natures, as this doctrine has been elsewhere more fully treated.

Thirdly, it is quite a different thing, if it be inquired, considered, or discussed, whether the natures in the personal union in Christ,

* Tom. 7, Wittemb., fol. 530.

have nothing else or not more than merely their natural, essential attributes alone ; for, that they have and retain these was shown above.

Now, in regard to the divine nature in Christ, since “with God there is no variableness,” James 1, 17, through the Incarnation nothing was taken from or added to the divine nature as to its essence and properties—it did not thereby receive an accession or suffer a diminution.

But, in reference to the assumed human nature in the person of Christ, some indeed have contended, that this, even in the personal union with the divinity, has nothing more than merely its natural, essential properties, according to which it is made in all things like unto his brethren, (Heb. 2, 17.) Hence they affirm, that nothing should nor can be ascribed to the human nature in Christ that is above or contrary to its natural properties, even if the testimony of the Scripture attributes such to the human nature of Christ. But that this opinion is false and wrong, is so evident from the Word of God, that their own associates now reprehend and reject this error. For the holy Scriptures, and the ancient Fathers, upon the authority of the Scriptures, testify forcibly that the human nature in Christ, for the reason and from the circumstance, that it is personally united with the divine nature, in Christ, (having laid aside the form of a servant and the state of humiliation, being now glorified, and exalted to the right hand of the majesty and power of God,) has received over and above its natural, essential, and permanent human properties, also special, high, great, supernatural, inscrutable, ineffable, heavenly prerogatives and pre-eminence in majesty, glory, power, and might, above all that can be named, not only in this world, but also in that which is to come, (Eph. 1, 21 ;) so that the human nature in Christ (in its measure and mode) was associated in the execution of the office of Christ, and also has its efficacy, that is, its virtue and operation, not only from, and according to, its natural, essential properties, or so far only as its ability extends, but chiefly from, and according to, the majesty, the glory, the power, and the might which it has received through the personal union, the glorification, and exaltation. And this our adversaries can scarcely dare to deny now ; except that they dispute and contend that these are merely created gifts, or finite qualities, with which the human nature in Christ is endowed and adorned, like those in the saints ; and that, by their own thoughts and by their own argumentations, or proofs, they attempt to measure, and to calculate of what the human nature in Christ, without being itself abolished, can or should be capable or incapable.

But the best, surest, and safest course to be pursued in this controversy is this, namely, to hold that no one can know better or more thoroughly what Christ has received according to his assumed human nature, through the personal union, the glorification or exaltation, and what his assumed human nature is capable of, above its natural properties without being abolished, than Christ our Lord himself; but he has revealed these things in his Word, so far as it is necessary for us to know them in this life. Now, in reference to this matter, so far as we have clear and indubitable testimony in the Scripture, we should simply believe it, and in no wise dispute in opposition to it, as if the human nature in Christ were not capable of such things. Now it is rightly and truly said, in reference to the created gifts given and communicated to the human nature in Christ, that this human nature possesses these gifts in or of itself. But these gifts do not yet attain to the majesty which the Scriptures and the ancient Fathers, agreeably to the Scriptures, ascribe to the assumed human nature in Christ.

For, to make alive, to have all dominion and all power in heaven and on earth, to hold all things in his hands, to have all things in subjection under his feet, to purify from sins, &c., are not created gifts, but divine and infinite attributes, which are nevertheless, according to the declaration of the Scripture, given and communicated to the man Christ, John 5, 27, and 6, 39; Matt. 28, 18; Dan. 7, 14; John 3, 35, and 13, 3; Matt. 11, 28; Eph. 1, 22; Heb. 2, 8; 1 Cor. 15, 27; John 1, 3.

And the fact that this communication is not to be understood *per phrasin aut modum loquendi*, that is, merely verbally, or as a mere phrase, concerning the person of Christ according to the divine nature alone, but according to the assumed human nature, is proved by these three strong and irrefutable arguments which follow:

1. It is a rule approved by the whole, ancient, orthodox church, unanimously—that whatever the holy Scriptures testify that Christ has received in time, he received not according to the divine nature, (according to which he had all things from eternity,) but the person of Christ has received it in time, *ratione et respectu humanæ naturæ*, that is, according to the assumed human nature.

2. The Scriptures, John 5, 21, 22, and 6, 39, clearly testify, that the power, to quicken and to judge, is given to Christ, because he is the Son of man, and because he has flesh and blood.

3. The Scriptures do not speak only in general concerning the person of the Son of man, but refer also expressly to his assumed human nature, when it is said, 1 John 1, 7: *The blood of Jesus Christ*

his Son cleanseth us from all sin—not only according to the merit which was once acquired upon the cross; but in this place John is speaking of this matter, namely, that in the work or act of justification, not only the divine nature in Christ, but also his *blood* cleanses us from all sin, *per modum efficaciz*, that is, effectively. Thus, John 6, 51, the *flesh of Christ* is a quickening food. And from this declaration of the Apostle, the Council of Ephesus concluded that the *flesh* of Christ has the power to quicken. And concerning this article there are many other excellent testimonies derived from the ancient, orthodox church, elsewhere in our writings.

We should and must, therefore, believe, according to the Scriptures, that Christ received this power according to his human nature, and that it is given and communicated to the assumed human nature in Christ. But, as already stated above, since the two natures in Christ are so united that they are not mixed together, or that one nature is changed into the other, and since each one retains its natural, essential attributes, so that those of the one nature never become the attributes of the other nature, this doctrine must also be correctly explained, and diligently secured against all heresies.

Now, in reference to this matter, we advance no new thoughts of our own, but receive and repeat the declarations which the ancient, orthodox church has given on good grounds, derived from the holy Scriptures, concerning this subject; namely, that this divine virtue, life, power, majesty, and glory, are given to the assumed human nature in Christ; but not in such a manner as the Father communicated unto the Son, according to his divine nature, his essence and all the divine attributes, from eternity, by which he is of one essence with the Father, and equal with God. For Christ is equal with the Father according to the divine nature alone; but according to the assumed human nature he is subordinate to God. From this it is evident, that we establish no confusion, equalization, or abolition of the natures in Christ. And consequently, the power to quicken does not exist in the flesh of Christ in the same manner as it does in his divine nature, namely, as an essential attribute.

But this communication was not effected through an essential or natural infusion of the properties of the divine nature into the human, as if the humanity of Christ had them for itself and separated from the divine essence; or, as if through this communication, the human nature in Christ had even laid aside its natural, essential properties, and were now changed either into the divinity, or were in and of itself equal with it with these communicated properties; or, that now both natures should be of the same, or indeed, of equal, natural,

essential properties and operations. For these and similar errors were justly rejected and condemned by authority of the Scripture, in the ancient and approved councils. *Nullo enim modo vel facienda vel admittenda est, aut conversio, aut confusio, aut exæquatio, sive naturarum in Christo, sive essentialium proprietatum.* That is: For in no manner shall there be made or admitted, a conversion, or a confusion, or an equalization of the natures in Christ, or of their essential properties.

And indeed, we have never understood these words (*realis communicatio*, or *realiter communicari*, that is, the communication or communion which takes place in deed and in truth,) concerning a *physica communicatio vel essentialis transfusio*, that is, concerning an essential, natural communion or effusion, through which the natures are mixed in their essence and in their essential properties, as some have craftily and maliciously perverted these words and expressions, contrary to the dictates of their own consciences, for the purpose of rendering the pure doctrine questionable; but we have only used them in opposition to a *verbalis communicatio*, that is, to that doctrine, according to which these persons pretend, that this communication is merely a *phrasis*, or *modus loquendi*, that is, nothing more than mere words, names, and titles; and upon this verbal communication they insisted so strenuously, that they would know of no other communication. Wherefore, for the purpose of truly explaining the majesty of Christ, we have used these words, (*de reali communicatione*,) and wished to indicate by them, that this communication has really taken place, yet without any confusion of the natures and of their essential properties.

Thus, then, we hold and teach with the ancient, orthodox church, as she has explained this doctrine from the Scriptures, that the human nature in Christ has received this majesty according to the manner of the personal union; namely, that since all the fulness of the Godhead dwells in Christ, Col. 2, 9, not as in holy men or angels, but *bodily*, as in its own body, it shines forth with all its majesty, power, glory, and operation, in the assumed human nature, voluntarily, when and as Christ pleases, exercising, showing, and perfecting his divine power, glory, and operation, in, with, and through this assumed human nature, as the soul in the body and fire in red-hot iron do; (for by these similitudes, as already stated, the whole, ancient church explained this doctrine.) This majesty of the human nature was hidden and restrained in the time of the humiliation. But now, since the form of a servant is laid aside, the majesty of Christ appears fully, efficiently, and manifestly before all the saints in heaven

and on earth, and we also in the life to come shall see his glory face to face, John 17, 24.

For this reason, there is and remains in Christ only one divine omnipotence, power, majesty, and glory, which is the property of the divine nature alone. But all this shines forth, exhibits, and manifests itself fully, yet spontaneously, in, with, and through the assumed, exalted human nature in Christ, precisely as, to shine and to burn are not two properties of iron, but the power to shine and to burn is the property of the fire; but since the fire is united with iron, it exhibits and manifests its power to shine and to burn, in, with, and through this red-hot iron; so that also the red-hot iron through this union, has the power to shine and to burn, without a change of the essence and of the natural properties of the fire or of the iron.

Wherefore, these testimonies of the Scripture, which speak concerning the majesty, to which the human nature in Christ is exalted, we receive not in the sense that this divine majesty (which is the property of the divine nature of the Son of God) in the person of the Son of man, should be ascribed to Christ according to his divine nature alone, or that this majesty should be in the human nature of Christ only in such a manner that his human nature should have merely the bare title and name of this divine majesty, *per phrasin et modum loquendi*, that is, merely in words, but have no communion at all with it, in deed and in truth. For, (since God is a spiritual, undivided essence, and is accordingly every where and in every creature, and in whomsoever he is—dwelling especially in the believing and in the saints—there he has his majesty with and by himself,) it might also, according to the above false hypothesis, be said with truth, that in every creature, in whom God is, but especially in the believer and the saint, in whom God dwells, all the fulness of the Godhead dwells bodily, in these all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden, to these all power in heaven and on earth is given, since unto them the Holy Spirit, who has all power, is given. But in this manner there would be no distinction made between Christ according to his human nature and other holy men, and thus he would be robbed of his majesty, which he has received above all creatures, as man, or according to his human nature. For no other creature, neither man nor angel, can or should say: "All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth;" although God is in the saints with all the fulness of the Godhead, which he has every where with himself; but he does not dwell in them *bodily*, nor is he *personally* united with them as in Christ. For, by reason of this personal union, Christ says, even according to his human nature: "All

power is given unto me in heaven and in earth," Matt. 28, 18. Again, "Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands," John 13, 3. Again, "In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily," Col. 2, 9. Again, "Thou hast crowned him with glory and honor. Thou madest him to have dominion over the works of thy hands: thou hast put all things under his feet," Psalms 8, 5, 6. "For in that he put all in subjection under him, he left nothing that is not put under him," Heb. 2, 7, 8. "But when he saith all things are put under him, it is manifest that he is excepted which did put all things under him," 1 Cor. 15, 27.

In no respect, however, do we believe, teach, or confess, that there is such an effusion of the majesty of God and of all its attributes into the human nature of Christ, that thereby the divine nature is weakened, or that thereby any portion of its attributes is so transferred to the human nature, as not to be retained in itself; or, that the human nature has received in its substance and essence equal divine majesty, separated or distinguished from the nature and essence of the Son of God, as when water, wine, or oil is poured out of one vessel into another. For neither the human nature, nor any other creature, either in heaven or on earth, is susceptible of the omnipotence of God, in such a manner as to become an almighty essence of itself, or to have almighty attributes in and of itself. For in this manner the human nature in Christ would be denied, and transmuted wholly and entirely into the divine,—which is contrary to our Christian faith, and to the doctrine of all the Prophets and Apostles.

But we believe, teach, and confess, that God the Father so gave his Spirit unto Christ his beloved Son, according to the assumed humanity, (hence he is also called Messiah, that is, the Anointed,) that he received the gifts of this Spirit not by *measure*, (John 3, 34,) as other saints. For upon Christ our Lord, according to his assumed human nature (since according to his divinity he is of one essence with the Holy Spirit) rests "the spirit of wisdom and understanding, the spirit of counsel and might, the spirit of knowledge and of the fear of the Lord," Isa. 11, 2; 61, 1; Col. 2, 3. But this takes place not in such a manner that as man, he knows and is able to accomplish only some things, as the saints, through the Spirit of God, (who works in them only created gifts,) know and are able to accomplish some things only; but since Christ, according to his divinity, is the second person in the holy Trinity, and since from him as well as from the Father, the Holy Spirit proceeds, and consequently is and remains his and the Father's own Spirit to all eternity, not separated from the Son of God; therefore unto Christ, according to the flesh, which

is personally united with the Son of God, the whole fulness of the Spirit, (as the Fathers say,) is communicated through this personal union; and with all its power, this freely exhibits and exerts itself in, with, and through the human nature of Christ, so that he knows not some things, while he is ignorant of others, and is able to accomplish some things, but is unable to accomplish others; but he knows and is able to accomplish all things. For the Father poured out upon the Son, without measure, the Spirit of wisdom and of power, so that he, as man, has received through this personal union, all knowledge and all power in deed and in truth. And thus all the treasures of wisdom are hidden in him; thus all power is given unto him, and he is seated at the right hand of the majesty and power of God. We are taught by history, that in the days of the emperor Valens, there was a peculiar sect among the Arians, who were called *Agnœtæ*, because they imagined that the Son, the Word of the Father, knows all things indeed; but that many things are unknown to his assumed human nature. This heresy also Gregory the Great refuted.

On account of this personal union, and the communication following from it, which the divine and human natures in the person of Christ have with each other, in deed and in truth, such things are attributed to Christ according to the flesh, which his flesh according to its nature and essence cannot be in itself, and which it cannot have apart from this union: namely, that his flesh is a true, vivifying food, and that his blood is a true, vivifying drink; as the two hundred Fathers of the Council of Ephesus have testified, "*Carnem Christi esse vivificam seu vivificatricem*," that is, that the flesh of Christ is a life-giving flesh; hence too, this man, alone, and no other man, either in heaven or on earth, can say with truth: "Where two or three are gathered together in my name, there am I in the midst of them," Matt. 18, 20. Again, "I am with you always, even unto the end of the world," ch. 28, verse 20.

And these testimonies of Scripture we receive not in the sense, that only the divinity of Christ is present with us in the Christian church and congregation, as if this presence in no way pertained to Christ according to his humanity. For in this manner Peter, Paul, and all the saints in heaven,—since the divinity, which is every where, dwells in them,—would also be present with us on earth; a fact which the holy Scripture, however, testifies concerning Christ alone, and concerning no other man. But we maintain that by the foregoing testimonies, the majesty of the man Christ, is declared, which Christ, according to his humanity, received at the right hand of the majesty and power of God; namely, that according to and with this his

assumed human nature, he *can* be and *is* present wherever he pleases, and particularly that he is present with his church and congregation on earth, as Mediator, Head, King, and High Priest ; not divided, or only in part, but the whole person of Christ, to which pertain both natures, the divine and the human ; not only according to his divinity, but also according to and with his assumed human nature, according to which he is our brother, and we are flesh of his flesh, and bone of his bone, Eph. 5, 30. And indeed, he instituted his holy Supper for a more certain assurance and confirmation of the fact that, according to the nature by which he has flesh and blood, he will be with us, will dwell in us, will operate in us, and be efficacious.

Upon such incontrovertible grounds, Dr. Luther, of sacred memory, has written concerning the majesty of Christ according to his human nature.

In his Larger Confession concerning the Supper of the Lord, he writes thus in reference to the person of Christ : * “ But now he is such a man, namely, who is supernaturally one person with God, and apart from this man there is no God ; hence it must follow that according to that third supernatural mode also, he is and may be in all places wherever God is, and all is thoroughly full of Christ, even according to his humanity, not in that first corporeal, comprehensible mode, but according to the supernatural, divine mode.

“ For here you must pause and say, that according to his divinity, wherever he is, there Christ is a natural, divine person, and is also there naturally and personally ; as indeed his conception in his mother’s womb shows. For if he be the Son of God, he must be naturally and personally in his mother’s womb, and must become man. Now, if he is naturally and personally, where he is, there he must also be man ; for in Christ there are not two separated persons, but there is only one person. Wherever this is, there it is the one undivided person. And in whatsoever place you can rightly say, God is here, there you must also say, the man Christ is here. And if you would point out any place where God might be, and not the man, the person would already be divided, because I could then say with truth, here is God who is not man, and who has never yet become man.

“ But I cannot have such a God. For from this it would follow that space and situation separate the two natures from each other, and divide the person, whereas not death, nor all the devils

* Tom. 2, Wittemb., German, fol. 191.

are able to divide or separate them. And indeed, such a Christ would be of little value to me, who could only be at one single place at one time a divine and a human person, and who at all other places must be a separate God merely, and a divine person without humanity. No, friend, wherever you place God for me, there you must also place the humanity in connection; for the two natures in Christ can neither be separated nor divided: they have become one person in Christ, and the Son of God does not separate from himself the assumed humanity.”

In his small work on the last words of David,* Dr. Luther, a little before his death, wrote thus: “According to the other, the temporal, human birth, the eternal power of God was also given unto him, but in time, and not from eternity. For the humanity of Christ has not been from eternity, like the divinity, but, according to our computation, Jesus the Son of Mary is now 1543 years of age. But from that moment, in which the divinity and humanity were united in one person, the man, the Son of Mary, truly is, and is called the omnipotent, eternal God; who has eternal power, who created and preserves all things, *per communicationem idiomatum*, because with the divinity, he is one person, and is also true God. Concerning this, he says: ‘All things are delivered unto me of my Father,’ Matt. 11, 27. And in another place: ‘All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth,’ Matt. 28, 18. Who is he that says: ‘Unto me?’ Unto me, Jesus of Nazareth, the Son of Mary, and born as man. From eternity I have this power of the Father, before I became man. But when I became man, I received it in time according to the humanity, and held it concealed until my resurrection and ascension, when it was to be manifested and declared;—as Paul, Rom. 1, 4, writes: ‘He was declared to be the Son of God with power;’” John uses the term *glorified*, John 17, 10.

Similar testimonies are found in the writings of Dr. Luther, but especially in his book entitled: *That these words* (this is my body) *remain unshaken*, and in his Larger Confession concerning the holy sacrament of the Lord’s Supper. To these writings, as being well-founded explanations concerning the majesty of Christ at the right hand of God and of his testament, we refer, for the sake of brevity, in this article as well as in the article concerning the holy Supper of the Lord, as we have already stated.

We, therefore, regard it as a pernicious error, to take away that majesty from Christ according to his humanity. For in this way

* Tom. 5, Wittenb., German, fol. 515.

Christians are deprived of their chief consolation, which they derive from the aforementioned promises concerning the presence and indwelling of their Head, their King, and High Priest, who has promised them that not only his divinity should be with them, (which to us miserable sinners is as a consuming fire to dry stubble,) but he, yea he, the man who conversed with the disciples, who tasted every kind of tribulation in his assumed human nature, and who, from that circumstance, can have compassion on us, as on men who are his brethren, will be with us in all our afflictions, even arrayed in that nature according to which he is our brother, while we are flesh of his flesh.

Wherefore, with one consent, we reject and condemn with our lips and our hearts, as repugnant to the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, to the authentic Symbols, and to our Christian Augsburg Confession, all errors, opposed to the doctrine which we have now laid down; such as these:

1. If it should be believed or taught by any one, that the human nature, on account of the personal union, is mingled with the divine, or changed into the same.

2. That the human nature in Christ is every where present in the same manner as the divinity is, namely, as an infinite essence, through the essential power and property of its own nature.

3. Again, that the human nature in Christ has become equal to the divine nature in its substance and essence, or in its essential attributes.

4. Again, that the humanity of Christ is locally expanded into all places in heaven and on earth,—a thing which is not to be attributed even to the divinity. But that Christ by his divine omnipotence can be present where he pleases with his body, (which he has placed at the right hand of the majesty and power of God,) especially where he has promised to be present, as in the holy Supper, this indeed his omnipotence and wisdom can effect, without a transmutation or an abolition of his true human nature.

5. Again, that the human nature in Christ alone has suffered for us, and redeemed us, with which nature the Son of God should have had no communication at all in the passion.

6. Again, that Christ according to his divine nature alone, is present with us on earth, in the preached Word and in the holy Sacraments, where they are legitimately used, and that this presence of Christ does by no means concern his assumed human nature.

7. Again, that the assumed human nature in Christ has no communication at all, in deed and in truth, with the divine virtue, power,

wisdom, majesty, and glory; but that it has in common only the titles and names.

These errors, and all that is contrary and adverse to the doctrine here stated, we reject and condemn as repugnant to the pure Word of God, the holy Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, and to our Christian Faith and Confession. And since in the holy Scripture, Christ is called a mystery, against which all heretics dash their heads, we admonish all Christians not to pry curiously into these mysteries with their human reason; but with the beloved Apostles, simply to believe, to close the eyes of their reason, to bring into captivity every thought to the obedience of Christ, (2 Cor. 10, 5,) and to console themselves in him; and thus to rejoice without ceasing, that our flesh and blood in Christ are placed so high at the right hand of the majesty and almighty power of God. Thus we shall find assuredly permanent consolation in all adversity, and be well secured against pernicious errors.

IX. OF CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL.

Since various explanations of the article concerning Christ's descent into hell, are found among the ancient Christian teachers, as well as among some of our divines, we leave the matter in the simple form in which it appears in the Apostles' Creed, to which Dr. Luther refers in his sermon delivered in the Castle at Torgau, A. D. 1533,* concerning Christ's descent into hell; for in that Symbol we make this confession: "I believe in Christ the Lord, the Son of God, who died, and was buried, and descended into hell." In this confession we perceive that the burial of Christ and his descent into hell, are distinguished as different articles. We therefore, in simplicity, believe that the whole person, God and man, after his burial, descended into hell, and destroyed its power, conquered the devil, and took away all his power. But in reference to the manner in which this was effected, we should not bewilder ourselves with wild and daring thoughts. For this article can be as little comprehended by human reason and the senses, as the preceding one with respect to the manner in which Christ is seated at the right hand of the almighty power and majesty of God; but it must be simply believed, and the Word of God is to be strictly adhered to. And thus we retain the sound doctrine, and have the consolation, that neither the devil nor hell can ensnare or injure us or any one who believes in Christ.

* *Tom. 6. oper. Jen. fol. 76-78.*

X. OF CHURCH USAGES OR CEREMONIES,

COMMONLY CALLED ADIAPHORA, OR THINGS INDIFFERENT.

Among some theologians of the Augsburg Confession, a controversy has likewise arisen concerning those ceremonies or church usages which are neither commanded nor prohibited in the Word of God, but are introduced into the church for the purpose of preserving good order and decorum, or other Christian discipline. The one party maintained, that in times of persecution, when it may be necessary to make known our confession, even if the enemies of the Gospel do not agree with us in doctrine, we might nevertheless, with clear conscience, upon the urgent demand of our adversaries, re-establish certain abrogated ceremonies, which are things indifferent in themselves, neither commanded nor prohibited of God; and thus conform to them in such *adiaphora*, or indifferent things. But the other party contended, that in times of persecution, when a confession of faith is required, we can by no means, without violating the conscience, and without injuring divine truth, yield to our adversaries; especially, when they exact such a compliance for the purpose of suppressing the pure doctrine, and of gradually introducing their own false doctrine into our churches again, either by open violence and force, or by secret machinations.

For the purpose of explaining this controversy, and, by the grace of God, of determining it fully, we shall give the Christian reader the following simple statement respecting it:

If such things are proposed under the title and character of things external and indifferent, which, although they be concealed under a false color, are nevertheless really adverse to the Word of God, they must not be regarded as things indifferent and discretionary, but must be avoided as things that are forbidden of God. And indeed, among things which are really indifferent and discretionary, those ceremonies must not be numbered, which have the appearance, (or assume the appearance for the sake of avoiding persecution,) as if our religion differed but little from that of the Papists; or as if the same were not most offensive to us; or when these ceremonies are required or re-established with a view to unite the two conflicting religions, and to form them into one body; or when there is danger of thereby returning to Popery, and of departing from the pure doctrine of the Gospel and from true religion; or when these results may gradually ensue.

For in such cases, that which Paul writes, shall and must have its authority: "Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for

what communion hath light with darkness?" "Wherefore, come out from among them, and be ye separate, saith the Lord," 2 Cor. 6, 14, 17.

And in like manner, things which are unnecessary, and which may be regarded as foolish spectacles, not tending to the preservation either of good order, or of Christian discipline, or of evangelical prosperity in the church, are not truly indifferent, or *adiaphora*.

But in reference to things which are really *adiaphora*, or indifferent, (as explained above,) we believe, teach, and confess, that such ceremonies, in and of themselves, are not divine service, nor any part of it, but must be duly distinguished from it. For thus it is written: "In vain they do worship me, teaching for doctrines the commandments of men," Matt. 15, 9.

Accordingly, we believe, teach, and confess, that in all places and at all times, the church of God has authority and power, according to circumstances, to alter, to diminish, or to increase these ceremonies, if it is done decently and in order, without levity and offence, as it may at any time be deemed most useful, profitable, and conducive to good order, Christian discipline, evangelical propriety, and to the edification of the church. And how far, in these outward and indifferent things, we can with good conscience concede and yield to the weak in faith, Paul teaches, Rom. 14, 21, and indicates by his example, Acts 16, 3, and ch. 21, 26, and 1 Cor. 9, 19.

We also believe, teach, and confess, that in a time when a confession of divine truth is required, namely, when the enemies of the Word of God desire to suppress the pure doctrine of the holy Gospel, the whole church of God, yes, every Christian, but especially the ministers of the Word, as the overseers of the church of God, are under obligation, by virtue of the divine Word, to confess, not only in words, but also in deeds and in acts, the doctrine and all that pertains to the entire system of religion, freely and openly. And in this case, we believe that even in these indifferent things, they should neither yield to their adversaries, nor permit these things to be forced upon themselves by the enemy, either by violence or secret artifice, to the detriment of the right service of God, and to the introduction and establishment of idolatry. For thus it is written: "Stand fast, therefore, in the liberty wherewith Christ hath made us free, and be not entangled again with the yoke of bondage," Gal. 5, 1. Again: "And that because of false brethren unawares brought in, who came in privily to spy out our liberty which we have in Christ Jesus, that they might bring us into bondage; to whom we gave place by subjection, no not for an hour, that the truth of the Gospel might continue with you," Gal. 2, 4, 5.

And in this place Paul speaks concerning circumcision, which at that time was made a discretionary and indifferent thing, 1 Cor. 7, 18. And at another time it was employed in spiritual liberty by Paul, Acts 16, 3. But, when the false apostles required and misused circumcision for the confirmation of their false doctrine, as if the works of the law were necessary to righteousness and salvation, Paul declares that he would not give place for a single hour, so that the truth of the Gospel might continue.

Thus Paul yields and gives place to the weak in faith, in meat, and times, or days, Rom. 14, 6. But to the false apostles, who wish to impose these observances upon the conscience, *as necessary things*, he will not yield, even in things which are discretionary and indifferent in themselves: "Let no man, therefore, judge you in meat, or in drink, or in respect of a holy-day," Col. 2, 16. And when in such a case, Peter and Barnabas yielded to some extent, Paul openly rebuked them as those who "walked not uprightly, according to the truth of the Gospel," Gal. 2, 14.

For here we are no longer concerned about things external and indifferent, which according to their nature and essence are, and continue to be free in themselves, and accordingly admit neither of a command nor of a prohibition, either to use or to omit them; but first of all, the great article of our Christian faith is here concerned, as the Apostle testifies: "That the truth of the Gospel might continue," Gal. 2, 5. For the truth of the Gospel is obscured and perverted, when these indifferent things are imposed on our conscience by any constraint or command, since these indifferent things are then either openly required for the confirmation of false doctrine, of superstition, and of idolatry, and for the suppression of the pure doctrine and of Christian liberty, or are at least regarded as misused for this purpose by the adversaries.

Here is involved, moreover, the article concerning Christian liberty, which the Holy Spirit through the mouth of the holy Apostle, so earnestly commanded his church to retain, as has just been stated. For, as soon as this article is weakened, and human traditions are obtruded by constraint on the church as necessary, as if the omission of these were wrong and sinful, the way to idolatry is already opened, by which human commands will afterwards be accumulated, and be held as divine service, not only equal to the commandments of God, but even superior to them.

Thus too, by this concession and conformity in external things, when there is not, previously, a union in doctrine effected in a Christian manner, the idolatrous are confirmed in their idolatry; but on the contrary, those who truly believe in Christ, are grieved and of-

fended, and weakened in their faith: both of which effects every Christian, who regards the happiness and salvation of his soul, is under obligation to endeavor to avoid, as it is written: "Wo unto the world because of offences!" Matt. 18, 7. Again, "Whoso shall offend one of these little ones which believe in me, it were better for him that a millstone were hanged about his neck, and that he were drowned in the depth of the sea," Matt. 18, 6.

But that especially, which Christ declares, should be considered: "Whosoever therefore shall confess me before men, him will I confess also before my Father which is in heaven," Matt. 10, 32.

And that such has ever been the faith and confession of the principal teachers of the Augsburg Confession, (in whose footsteps we walk, and in which confession, by the grace of God, we intend to persevere,) the following testimonies demonstrate, taken from the Smalcald Articles, which were written and subscribed A. D. 1537.

Testimonies from the Smalcald Articles, A. D. 1537.

With respect to this matter the Smalcald Articles declare thus: * "We by no means admit that they (the Papistical bishops) are the church, for they are not; and we shall likewise not listen to that which they command or forbid in the name of the church. For, praise be to God, a child of seven years old knows what the church is, namely, holy believers, and the lambs who hear the voice of their shepherd." And a little before: † "If the bishops would faithfully discharge their office, and take due care of the church and the Gospel, they might, for the sake of clarity and tranquillity, not however from necessity, be allowed the privilege of ordaining and confirming us and our preachers; yet, with this condition, that all unchristian masking, mummary, and jugglery should be removed. But, since they neither are nor wish to be true bishops, but political lords and princes, who will neither preach, nor teach, nor baptize, nor administer the Sacrament, nor transact any work or office in the church, but force, persecute, and condemn those who are called to this office, the church must not, on their account, remain destitute of ministers."

And, in the article concerning Popery, the Smalcald Articles declare thus: "Therefore, as little as we can adore the devil as a Lord or God, so little can we tolerate his apostle, the Pope or Anti-

* In the article concerning the church, see page 389.

† Concerning consecration and vocation, see page 388.

christ, as head and lord in his kingdom. For falsehood and murder, eternal destruction of body and of soul, is his Papal government chiefly," page 375.

And in the treatise concerning the Power and Primacy of the Pope, which was appended to the Smalcald Articles, and subscribed with their own hands, by the theologians who were present at that time, we find these words: "No one shall encumber the church with his own ordinances, and no one's power or reputation shall avail more than the Word of God," page 394.

And a little afterwards: "Inasmuch, then, as these things are so, all Christians should be fully on their guard, lest they make themselves partakers of this impious doctrine, blasphemy, and unjust cruelty; and should withdraw from the Pope and his members or accomplices, as from the kingdom of Anti-christ, and execrate it, as Christ has commanded: 'Beware of false prophets,' Matt. 7, 15. And Paul, Tit. 3, 10, commands: 'A man that is a heretic, after the first and second admonition, reject.' And 2 Cor. 6, 14, he says: 'Be ye not unequally yoked together with unbelievers; for what fellowship hath righteousness with unrighteousness?'"

"It is grievous, indeed, for a person to separate himself from so many countries and people, and to maintain this doctrine: but here stands the command of God, that each one should be on his guard, and not be an accomplice with those who promulgate false doctrines, or defend them with cruelty," page 400.

Thus too, Dr. Luther, in another writing, set forth his opinion and instructed the church of God, respecting ceremonies in general, and also indifferent things in particular, *Tom. 3, Jen., fol. 523*, in the year 1530; see also the German, *Tom. 5, Jen.*

From these explanations every one can understand what may be done or omitted with a good conscience, in things indifferent, by a Christian congregation, and by every Christian, and chiefly by every minister, particularly in a time when it is necessary that he should make a public confession of his faith, in order that God may not be displeased, or love be violated, or the enemies of the Word of God be strengthened, or the weak in faith be offended.

1. Accordingly, we reject and condemn as an error, when human traditions are held in themselves to be a divine service, or any part of it.

2. We also reject and condemn it as an error, when these traditions are obtruded with constraint, as necessary to be observed by the church of God.

3. We likewise repudiate and condemn as an error, the opinion of

those who maintain, that in times of persecution we may yield to the enemies of the holy Gospel, (which would cause the truth to suffer detriment,) or conform to them in these *adiaphora* or things indifferent.

4. In like manner we regard it as a sin deserving punishment, if in times of persecution, any thing, either in things indifferent, or in doctrine and in matters connected with religion, be actually done, contrary and in opposition to the Christian Confession, for the sake of the enemies of the Gospel.

5. We also reject and condemn the error of those who abolish these indifferent things, and who believe that the congregation of God should not be at liberty, at any time and place, to use one or more of these according to their circumstances, in Christian liberty, as it may be most useful for the church.

In this manner the congregations, on account of dissimilitude of ceremonies, when in Christian liberty one observes more or less of these than the other, should not condemn one another, if they are otherwise united with each other in doctrine and in all doctrinal articles, as also in a right use of the holy Sacraments, according to the well known saying: *Dissonantia jejunii non dissolvit consonantiam fidei*; that is, a difference in fasts does not destroy the agreement in matters of faith.

XI. OF GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE AND ELECTION.

Concerning the eternal election of the children of God, no public, offensive, and prolix controversy has hitherto arisen among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession. But, since in other places this article has been made a subject of serious contention, and since it is slightly agitated by some among us also, and has not always been set forth by theologians, with uniformity of expression, we have therefore, by the grace of God, in order to prevent disunion and dissension among our posterity, so far as it lies in our power, desired to insert an explanation of the subject here, that it might be known to all, what our unanimous doctrine, faith, and confession are concerning this article. For, the doctrine concerning this article, if it be set forth according to the analogy of the divine Word, neither can nor should be regarded as useless or unnecessary, much less as offensive or injurious, since the holy Scriptures mention this article not only at one place casually, but copiously treat and inculcate it in many places. Nor should the doctrine of the divine Word be neglected or rejected on account of the abuse or errors of others, but much rather should the true sense in

reference to this matter be explained according to the authority of the Scripture, for the purpose of averting all abuses and errors. Accordingly, the simple import and substance of the doctrine concerning this article, are comprehended in the following paragraphs :

In the first place, the difference between the *eternal foreknowledge* of God and the *eternal election* of his children to everlasting salvation, must be accurately observed. For the prescience or foresight of God, by which he sees and knows all things before they occur, and which is called the *foreknowledge of God*, extends to all creatures, the good and the bad : namely, he sees and knows all things before,—that which now is or will be, that which now occurs or will occur, whether it be good or bad, since before God all things, whether they be past or future, are manifest and present. For thus it is written : “Are not two sparrows sold for a farthing? and one of them shall not fall on the ground without your Father,” Matt. 10, 29. And Psalm 139, 16 : “Thine eyes did see my substance, yet being unperfect; and in thy book all my members were written, which in continuance were fashioned, when as yet there was none of them.” Again, Isa. 37, 28 : “I know thy abode, and thy going out, and thy coming in, and thy rage against me.”

But the *eternal election* or *predestination of God*, that is, the ordaining of God unto salvation, does not pertain both to the good and to the bad, but only to the children of God, who were elected and ordained to eternal life, before the foundation of the world, as Paul, Eph. 1, 4, 5, declares : “He hath chosen us in Christ Jesus, and predestinated us unto the adoption of children.”

The *foreknowledge of God* foresees evils also, and knows them before they happen, but this is not to be understood as if it were God’s gracious will that they should occur. But that which the perverse and evil will of the devil and of men, proposes and desires to do, God foresees and foreknows. And this foreknowledge, even in evil things and deeds, continues to act in its proper mode, so that God prescribes certain limits to these evils, which he neither desires nor approves; and definite bounds are assigned, which they cannot transgress, and limits are imposed declaring how long they may endure, and the time and the mode according to which they shall again be arrested and be subjected to punishment. And God so regulates all these things, that they contribute to the glory of his divine name, and to the salvation of his elect, while the wicked are confounded and put to shame.

The foreknowledge of God, however, is not the origin or the cause of evil; (for God does not create or cause evil, nor does he facilitate or

promote it;) but the wicked, perverted will of the devil and of men is the cause of evil. For thus it is written: "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help," Hos. 13, 9. Again, Psalm 5, 4: "Thou art not a God that hath pleasure in wickedness."

But the *eternal election of God* not only foresees and foreknows the salvation of the elect, but through his gracious will and good pleasure in Christ Jesus, is also the cause which procures, works, facilitates, and promotes our salvation and whatever pertains to it; and upon this our salvation is so firmly grounded that "the gates of hell shall not prevail against it," Matt. 16, 18. For it is written: "Neither shall any pluck my sheep out of my hand," John 10, 28. And again, Acts 13, 48: "And as many as were ordained to eternal life believed."

And yet this eternal election or *ordination* of God to everlasting life, must not be contemplated merely in the secret, inscrutable, council of God, as if it comprehended nothing more, or required nothing more, or as if nothing more were to be taken into consideration, than the fact that God foresees what men and how many will secure salvation, and what men and how many shall perish forever,—or as if the Lord would institute a certain military review, saying, this one shall be saved, but that one shall be lost; this one shall persevere to the end, but that one shall not persevere.

For, from this opinion, many derive and adopt strange, perilous, and pernicious thoughts, which produce and confirm either security and impenitence, or discouragement and despair; so that they indulge in hazardous reflections, saying: "Since God has predestined his elect to salvation, before the foundation of the world, Eph. 1, 4, 5, and God's election cannot fail, or be obstructed or changed by any one, Isa. 14, 27; Rom. 9, 19, if, therefore, I am elected to salvation, it cannot be impaired, even if I commit every manner of sin and shame without repentance, even if I do not regard the Word and Sacraments, nor concern myself about repentance, faith, prayer, or piety;—for I shall and must nevertheless be saved, because the election of God must stand; but if I am not predestined, it will avail nothing even if I do adhere to the Word, repent, believe, &c., for I can neither hinder nor change the predestination of God."

And such thoughts may arise in the minds even of the pious—although through the grace of God they repent, believe, and have a desire to live piously—when they thus address themselves: "If you are not elected to salvation from eternity, it is all still in vain." And especially do these thoughts present themselves, when the individual takes into consideration his own weakness, and views the examples of those who persevered not, but afterwards fell away.

In opposition to this false opinion and to these perilous thoughts, the following most firm position should be taken, which is sure, and cannot deceive our expectation, namely: It is certain, "all Scripture is given by inspiration of God," not to contribute to a feeling of security, and to impenitence, but to be "profitable for doctrine, for reproof, for correction, for instruction in righteousness," 2 Tim. 3, 16. It is also certain, that all things in the Word of God are prescribed unto us, not to drive us into despair, but "that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope," Rom. 15, 4. Wherefore, it is without any doubt, that *that* in no way is the sound sense, or the legitimate use of the doctrine concerning the eternal predestination of God; by which either impenitence or despair is excited or confirmed. Nor is this doctrine set forth in the Scripture in any other manner, than to direct us to the Word of God, Eph. 1, 13; 1 Cor. 1, 7, 8; to admonish us to repentance, 2 Tim. 3, 16; to encourage us to godliness, Eph. 1, 4, 13; John 15, 3; to strengthen our faith, and to assure us of our salvation, Eph. 1, 4, 13; John 10, 28; 2 Thess. 2, 13.

Wherefore, if we would reflect and discourse correctly and with advantage upon the eternal election or predestination and ordination of the children of God, to everlasting life, we should accustom ourselves, not to speculate upon the bare, hidden, secret, inscrutable foreknowledge of God, but to meditate on it in the manner in which the counsel, the purpose, and ordination of God, in Christ Jesus, who is the right and true book of life, are revealed unto us through the Word. Therefore, the whole doctrine concerning the purpose, the counsel, will, and ordination of God, belonging to our redemption, call, justification, and salvation, should be comprised together. For in this manner Paul treats and explains this article, Rom. 8, 29, 30; Eph. 1, 4, 5. And the same is also taught by Christ in the parable, Matt. 22, 1-14; namely, that in his counsel and purpose God ordained:

1. That the human race shall be truly redeemed and reconciled to God through Christ, who by his innocent obedience, suffering, and death, has merited for us that righteousness which avails before God, and eternal life.

2. That this merit of Christ and his benefits should be offered, administered, and distributed to us, through his Word and Sacraments.

3. That by his Holy Spirit, through the Word, when it is preached, heard, and considered, he will be efficacious and active in us, to turn our hearts unto true repentance, and to preserve us in the true faith.

4. That he will justify all those who in true repentance embrace

Christ in genuine faith, graciously receive them, and adopt them as children and heirs of eternal life.

5. That he will sanctify those in love, who are thus justified, as St. Paul, Eph. 1, 4, testifies.

6. That he will defend them in their great weakness, against the devil, the world, and the flesh; will govern and lead them in his ways, and, if they should stumble, raise them up again, and comfort and preserve them in trials and temptations.

7. That he will strengthen and extend in them that good work which he has commenced, and preserve them unto the end, if they adhere to the Word of God, are diligent in prayer, persevere in the grace of God, and faithfully use the gifts received.

8. That he will finally render those whom he has elected, called, and justified, eternally happy and glorious in everlasting life.

And in this counsel, purpose, and ordination, God has not only prepared salvation in general, but has mercifully considered also all and each person of the elect, who will ultimately be saved through Christ, has elected them to salvation, and decreed, that in the manner now mentioned, he will, through his grace, gifts, and operation, bring them to this salvation, assist them in it, promote it, and strengthen and preserve them.

All this, according to the Scripture, is comprehended in the doctrine concerning the eternal election of God to the adoption of children, and to everlasting salvation, and should be understood in this article; it ought never to be excluded or omitted, when we discourse of the purpose, predestination, election, and ordination of God to salvation. And, if our views are thus formed in reference to this article, agreeably to the Scriptures, we can, by the grace of God, properly understand it.

But it belongs to a fuller explanation of this subject, and to a salutary use of the doctrine concerning the predestination of God to salvation, that we should know (since only the elect will be saved, whose names stand written in the book of life,) by what means and whence it can be discerned who the elect are, who can and should embrace this doctrine to their own consolation.

In reference to this point, we should not judge according to our reason, or to the law, or to any external appearance; nor should we attempt to scrutinize the concealed, hidden depth of the divine predestination, but we should attend to the revealed will of God. "For he has made known unto us the mystery of his will," and brought it to light through Christ, that it might be preached, Eph. 1, 9, 10, 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9, 10.

But this is revealed unto us thus, as Paul, Rom. 8, 29, 30, declares: "Whom he did predestinate," elect and ordain, "them he also called." Now God does not call without means, but through the Word; hence he has commanded repentance and remission of sins to be preached. And Paul also testifies the same thing, where he writes: "We are ambassadors for Christ, as though God did beseech you by us—be ye reconciled to God," 2 Cor. 5, 20. And the guests, whom the king desired to have at the marriage of his son, he caused to be called by his servants whom he sent forth, Matt. 22, 3, 4. And the householder called into his vineyard, some at the first hour, others at the second, third, sixth, ninth, and even the eleventh hour, Matt. 20, 1-6.

If, therefore, we would profitably consider our eternal election to salvation, we must firmly and constantly observe this point, that, as the preaching of repentance is universal, so is also the promise of the Gospel, that is, it extends to all persons, Luke 24, 47. Therefore Christ commanded, "that repentance and remission of sins should be preached in his name among all nations." "For God so loved the world, that he gave his only-begotten Son" unto it, John 3, 16. "Christ taketh away the sin of the world," John 1, 29. Christ gave his flesh "for the life of the world," John 6, 51. His blood is "the propitiation for the sins of the whole world," 1 John 2, 2. Christ says: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest," Matt. 11, 28. "God hath concluded them all in unbelief, that he might have mercy upon all," Rom. 11, 32. "The Lord is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance," 2 Pet. 3, 9. "The same Lord over all is rich unto all that call upon him," Rom. 10, 12. "The righteousness of God, which is by faith of Jesus Christ unto all, and upon all them that believe, is manifest," Rom. 3, 22. "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life," John 6, 40. Thus it is the command of Christ, Luke 24, 47; Mark 16, 15, that in general unto all, unto whom repentance is preached, this promise of the Gospel should also be presented.

And this call of God, which is given through the preaching of the Word, we should not regard as pretended and unreal, but we ought to know that through it God reveals his will: namely, that in those whom he thus calls, he will operate through the Word; so that they may be enlightened, converted, and saved. For the Word, through which we are called, is a ministration of the Spirit, which imparts the Spirit, or through which the Spirit is conferred, 2 Cor. 3, 8;

and is the power of God unto salvation, Rom. 1, 16. And since the Holy Spirit will be efficacious through the Word, strengthen us, and administer power and ability, it is the will of God, that we should receive and believe the Word, and be obedient to it.

Hence the elect are thus described: "My sheep hear my voice, and I know them, and they follow me: and I give unto them eternal life," John 10, 27, 28. And Eph. 1, 11, 13: those who, *according to the purpose, are predestined to an inheritance*, hear the Gospel, believe in Christ, pray, and return thanks, and are sanctified in love, have hope, patience, and consolation in trials, Rom. 8, 16, 25; and although all these are very weak in them, yet they "hunger and thirst after righteousness." Matt. 5, 6.

Thus the Spirit of God bears witness unto the elect, that they are the children of God, and as they know not what they should pray for as they ought, he makes intercession for them with groanings which cannot be uttered, Rom. 8, 16, 26.

The holy Scriptures, moreover, testify that God, who has called us, is so faithful, that when he has begun this good work in us, he will also maintain it unto the end, and accomplish it, if we do not turn ourselves away from him, but hold the beginning of our confidence steadfast unto the end; whereunto also he has promised his grace, 1 Cor. 1, 9; Phil. 1, 6, 7; 1 Pet. 5, 10; 2 Pet. 3, 9, 15, 18; Heb. 3, 14.

With this revealed will of God we should occupy ourselves, and follow it, and study it diligently, since the Holy Spirit, through the Word, through which he calls us, grants grace, power, and ability for this purpose; and we should not pry into the abyss of the secret predestination of God. In this sense Christ, (Luke 13, 23, 24,) when one said unto him, "Lord, are there few that be saved?"—replied: "Strive to enter in at the straight gate." Thus says Luther: *—"Proceed in the order observed in the Epistle to the Romans. Concern yourself, in the first place, with Christ and his Gospel, that you may perceive both your sins and his grace; then, strive with sin, as Paul teaches from the first to the eighth chapter. Afterwards, if (in the eighth chapter,) you are tried by temptations and afflictions, you will be taught in the ninth, tenth, and eleventh chapters how consolatory the doctrine of divine predestination is."

But the divine vocation, which takes place through the Word, is not the cause that *many* are called, while *few* are chosen, Matt. 20, 16; as if such were the meaning of God: "Externally, through

*In this preface to the Epistle to the Romans.

the Word, I call you all indeed, to my kingdom, unto whom I give my Word, but in my heart I do not intend it for all, but for a few only; for it is my will, that the greater part of those, whom I call through the Word, should not be enlightened and converted, but be and remain damned, although I have declared myself otherwise towards them, through the Word by which they are called." *Hoc enim esset Deo contradictorias voluntates affingere.* That is, in this manner it would be taught that God, who is the eternal truth, contradicts himself; when at the same time God punishes such insincerity even in men, when a person declares a thing, and means and intends another in his heart, Psalm 5, 9, and 12, 23. In this way the necessary and consolatory foundation of our faith would also be rendered entirely uncertain and be destroyed, by which we are daily reminded and admonished that from the Word of God alone, through which he confers with us, and calls us, we should learn and determine what his will towards us is, and that whatever it assures and promises us, we should firmly believe, and not doubt in reference to it.

Wherefore, Christ causes the promise of the Gospel to be proposed not only in general, but he also seals it with the Sacraments, which he has attached as seals of the promise, and thus he confirms it to each believer in particular.

For this reason we retain private absolution, as the Augsburg Confession declares in the eleventh article, and we teach that it is the command of God that we should believe in this absolution, and feel assured that when we believe the words of the absolution, we are as truly reconciled unto God, as if we had heard a voice from heaven; as the Apology explains this article. But we should be wholly and entirely deprived of this consolation, if, from that call which is made through the Word and the Sacraments, we should not infer what the will of God toward us is.

And, further, the foundation of our religion would be subverted, namely, that the Holy Spirit is truly present when the Word is preached, heard, and considered, and will be efficacious and operate through it. It must, therefore, by no means be understood, as we have mentioned a little before, that those are the elect, who condemn, reject, blaspheme, and persecute the Word of God, Matt. 22, 5, 6; Acts 13, 46; who, hearing the Word, harden their hearts, Heb. 4, 2, 6, 7; who resist the Holy Spirit, Acts 7, 51; who persevere in sins without repentance, Luke 14, 18; who do not truly believe in Christ, Mark 16, 16; who have only an external appearance of piety, Matt. 7, 22, 23, and 22, 12; or, seek, apart from

Christ, other ways of righteousness and salvation, Rom. 9, 31. For, even as God has ordained in his counsel, that the Holy Spirit shall call, enlighten, and convert the elect, through the Word, and that he will justify and save all those who receive Christ through true faith: so he has also decreed in his counsel, that he will harden, reject, and condemn those who are called through the Word, if they cast off the Word, resist the Holy Spirit, who desires to be efficacious and to operate in them through the Word, and persevere in this course. And thus many are called, but few are chosen.

For few receive the Word and obey it. The greater part despise the Word, and will not come to the marriage-feast. The cause of this contempt of the Word is, not the foreknowledge of God, but the perverted will of man, which rejects or perverts the means and instrument of the Holy Spirit, which God offers unto it through the call, and it resists the Holy Spirit, who would be efficacious and operate through the Word; as Christ, Matt. 23, 37, says: *How often would I have gathered you together, and ye would not!*

Thus many receive the Word with joy, but afterwards fall away, Luke 8, 13. But this occurs not because God would not grant unto those, in whom he has begun this good work, his grace in order to perseverance; for this is contrary to the declaration of St. Paul, Phil. 1, 6; but because they contumaciously turn away again from the holy command, grieve and offend the Holy Spirit, entangle themselves in the pollutions of the world, and garnish the habitation of their hearts for Satan again. The latter end with these is worse than the beginning, 2 Pet. 2, 10, 20; Luke 11, 25, 26; Heb. 10, 26; Eph. 4, 30.

And thus far the mystery of predestination is revealed to us in the Word of God. If we continue in these bounds, and rely upon this Word, this doctrine is very useful, salutary, and consolatory; for it confirms most forcibly the article, that we are justified and saved by pure grace for the sake of Christ alone, without any of our own works and merits. Before the world began, before we existed, indeed before the foundation of the world, when certainly we could have done nothing good, we were elected to salvation by grace in Christ according to the purpose of God, Rom. 9, 11; 2 Tim. 1, 9. And by this doctrine, all false opinions and errors concerning the powers of our natural will, are overthrown; since, before the world began, God decreed and ordained in his counsel, that he himself by the power of his Holy Spirit, through the Word, would effect and work in us all that belongs to our conversion.

Thus this doctrine also affords the eminent and precious consola-

tion, that God took so deep an interest in the conversion, righteousness, and salvation of each Christian, and so faithfully provided for these, that before the foundation of the world, in his counsel and purpose, he ordained the manner in which he would bring me to salvation, and preserve me there; again, that he wished to secure my salvation so truly and firmly, that in his eternal purpose, which cannot fail or be overthrown, he decreed it, and to secure it, placed it in the omnipotent hands of our Savior, Jesus Christ, out of which none shall pluck us, John 10, 28. For, if our salvation were committed unto us, it might easily be lost through the weakness and wickedness of our flesh, or be taken and plucked out of our hands, by the fraud and power of the devil and of the world. Hence Paul, Rom. 8, 28, 35, 39, says: *Since we are called according to the purpose of God, who shall separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord.*

And in afflictions and temptations, most precious consolation may be derived from this doctrine. For it teaches, that before the world was made, God determined and decreed in his counsel, that in all our necessities he would be at our side, grant us patience, give us consolation, awaken hope in us, and produce such results as would tend to our salvation. Hence, St. Paul, Rom. 8, 28, 29, 35, 38, 39, in consolatory terms, teaches that God ordained in his purpose before the world was made, by what crosses and afflictions he would conform each one of his elect to the image of his Son; and that the crosses of each one must work together for his good, because he is called according to the purpose of God. Hence, Paul draws the sure and certain conclusion, that "neither tribulation nor distress, &c., neither death nor life, &c., can separate us from the love of God, which is in Christ Jesus, our Lord."

This article also affords us a noble testimony that the church of God will remain, and resist all the powers of hell, and it teaches likewise which is the true church of God, so that we may not stumble at the great power of the false church, Rom 9, 24, 25.

And from this article very serious admonitions and warnings are deduced; as, Luke 7, 30: "They rejected the counsel of God against themselves." "I say unto you, that none of those men which were bidden, shall taste of my Supper," Luke 14, 24. Again, Matt. 20, 16, and ch. 22, 14: "Many are called, but few are chosen." Again, Luke 8, 8, 18: "He that hath ears to hear, let him hear," and, "Take heed how ye hear." Thus the doctrine of this article can be employed in a useful, consolatory, and most profitable manner.

But a very accurate distinction must be made between that which

is expressly revealed in the Word of God in reference to this matter, and that which is not revealed. For, besides those things which we have thus far said, and which are revealed in Christ, God has also concealed and kept secret many things concerning this mystery, and reserved them for his own wisdom and knowledge alone ; into which things we ought not to search, nor indulge our imagination, nor inquire curiously, nor attempt to determine ; but we should adhere to the revealed Word. In relation to this mystery, this admonition is necessary in the highest degree.

For, our curiosity always occupies itself with these things, rather than with those which God has revealed unto us in his Word with respect to this matter, since we are unable to reconcile them in our minds,—which indeed we are not commanded to do.

Thus, there is no doubt that God foresaw precisely, and with the greatest certainty, before the world was made, and he knows still, who among those that are called, will believe or will not believe ; also, who among the converted will remain steadfast, and who will not remain steadfast ; who, if they fall back into sin, will return, and who will become hardened. Nor is there any doubt that the number of those who will be saved, and of those who will be lost, is known and seen of God. But since God has reserved this mystery unto his own wisdom, and has revealed nothing of it unto us in his Word, much less commanded us to search it out with our thoughts, but has earnestly restrained us from the attempt, Rom. 11, 33, we should not draw inferences in our minds, nor indulge in useless inquiries in reference to it, but we should adhere to his revealed Word to which he has referred us.

Thus too, God knows, without any doubt, and has appointed the season and time of each one's call and conversion ; but since he has not revealed these things unto us, we understand that it is enjoined upon us to occupy ourselves continually with the Word of God, but to commit the season and time to God, Acts 1, 7.

In the same manner, when we see that God gives his Word to one region, but not to another ; that he withdraws it from one people, but allows it to remain with another ; or that one man is hardened, blinded, and given over to a reprobate mind, but that another, though equally guilty, is converted to God, it is our duty, in such cases to remember that Paul, Rom. 11, 22, 23, has assigned certain limits to us, beyond which we are not allowed to inquire. For, he instructs us to consider the judgment of God to be just, in the case of those who perish. For it is the well-merited punishment of sin, when, in the case of any country or people, God so inflicts pun-

ishment on account of the contempt of his Word, that it extends also to succeeding generations, as we perceive to be the case with the Jews; thus, in the case of some countries or individuals, God exhibits his severity, or the penalties which we had deserved, and of which we were worthy, since we, too, did not walk in a manner worthy of God's Word, but often deeply grieved the Holy Spirit; so that, being thus admonished, we might live in the fear of God, and acknowledge and praise the goodness of God, shown to us and in us, without or contrary to our merit, to whom he gives his Word, whom he allows to retain it, and whom he does not harden and reject.

For, since our nature is corrupted by sin, and worthy of and exposed to divine wrath and everlasting condemnation, God is not under any obligation to bestow upon us his Word, his Spirit, or his grace. Even when he graciously grants us his gifts, we often reject them, and render ourselves unworthy of everlasting life, Acts 13, 46. He, therefore, proposes his righteous judgment, which men deserve, for our contemplation; in the case of some countries, nations, and individuals, in order that, by comparing ourselves with them, and by discovering our great similarity to them, we may see and praise with so much the greater diligence, the pure, unmerited grace of God, manifested to the vessels of mercy, (Rom. 9, 23.)

For those who suffer punishment and receive the wages of their sins, are not dealt with unjustly. But in the case of those to whom God gives and preserves his Word, by which men are enlightened, converted, and saved, the Lord commends his boundless grace and unmerited mercy.

When we proceed thus far in this article, we remain in the right path, as it is written: "O Israel, thou hast destroyed thyself; but in me is thine help," Hos. 13, 9.

But whenever our thoughts would transcend these limits in this investigation, we should immediately repress them as St. Paul does, remembering the declaration: "O man, who art thou that repliest against God?" Rom. 9, 20.

For, that we neither can nor should search out and fathom all that is contained in this article, the distinguished apostle Paul testifies. For, after having largely discussed this article, agreeably to the revealed Word of God, as soon as he is led to speak of those things which God has reserved unto his hidden wisdom concerning this mystery, he desists, and at once closes with these words: "O the depth of the riches both of the wisdom and knowledge of God! how unsearchable are his judgments, and his ways past finding out! For who hath known the mind of the Lord?" Rom. 11, 33, 34;

that is, besides and above that which he has revealed unto us in his Word.

Accordingly, this eternal election of God must be considered *in Christ*, and not *apart from*, or *without Christ*. For *in Christ*, as the holy apostle Paul testifies, we were chosen before the foundation of the world, Eph. 1, 4; as it is written: "He hath made us accepted in the Beloved," Eph. 1, 6. But this election is revealed from heaven, through the preached word, when the Father says: "This is my beloved Son, in whom I am well pleased; hear ye him," Matt. 17, 5; Luke 3, 22. And Christ, Matt. 11, 28, says: "Come unto me, all ye that labor and are heavy laden, and I will give you rest." And concerning the Holy Spirit, Christ says: "He shall glorify me; for he shall receive of mine, and shall show it unto you," John 16, 14. So that the entire holy Trinity, God the Father, Son, and Holy Ghost, directs all persons to Christ, as to the book of life, in whom they should seek the eternal election of the Father. For this was decreed from eternity by the Father, that those whom he would save, he would save through Christ; as Christ himself says: "No man cometh unto the Father, but by me," John 14, 6. And again: "I am the door: by me, if any man enter in, he shall be saved," John 10, 9.

But Christ, as the only-begotten Son of God, who is in the bosom of the Father, John 1, 18, has revealed the will of the Father unto us, and consequently our eternal election to everlasting life too; namely, when he says: "The kingdom of God is at hand: repent ye, and believe the Gospel," Mark 1, 15. Again, he says: "This is the will of him that sent me, that every one which seeth the Son, and believeth on him, may have everlasting life," John 6, 40. And moreover: "God so loved the world," &c., John 3, 16.

These declarations the Father desires all men to hear, in order that they may come unto Christ. But Christ will not cast from himself those who come, for it is written: "Him that cometh to me, I will in no wise cast out," John 6, 37.

Now, in order that we may come unto Christ, the Holy Spirit works true faith in us through the hearing of the Word, as the Apostle testifies, when he says: "So then, faith cometh by hearing, and hearing by the Word of God," Rom. 10, 17; when, namely, it is preached in purity and sincerity.

Wherefore, whoever desires to be saved, should not trouble or harass himself with thoughts concerning the secret counsel of God, whether he is also elected and ordained to eternal life; by which anxieties Satan is accustomed maliciously to disturb and torment

pious minds: but he should rather listen to Christ, who is the book of life and of the divine, eternal election of all the children of God to everlasting life; and who testifies to all men without distinction, that God desires all men to come unto him, who are burdened with sins and heavy-laden, in order that they may have rest and be saved.

According to this doctrine of Christ, we should abstain from sin, repent, and believe his promise, and rely wholly and entirely upon him. But, since we are unable to do this by our own powers and of ourselves, the Holy Spirit desires to work in us repentance and faith, through the Word and the Sacraments. And, in order that we may be enabled to proceed onward in this course, persevere therein, and remain steadfast, we should call upon God for his grace, which he has promised us in holy Baptism, and not doubt that he will impart it unto us according to his promise. For thus Christ has promised, saying: "If a son shall ask bread of any of you that is a father, will he give him a stone?—Or, if he shall ask an egg, will he offer him a scorpion? If ye, then, being evil, know how to give good gifts unto your children; how much more shall your heavenly Father give the Holy Spirit to them that ask him?" Luke 11, 11, 12, 13.

And inasmuch as the Holy Spirit dwells in the elect, who now believe in Christ, 1 Cor. 3, 16, as in his temple, and is not inactive in them, but impels the children of God to obey the commands of God, believers should likewise not be inactive, much less resist the operation of the Spirit of God, but exercise themselves in all Christian virtues, in all piety, modesty, temperance, patience, and brotherly love, and use all diligence *to make their calling and election sure*, 2 Pet. 1, 10; so that they may doubt the less, the more they feel the power and energy of the Spirit in themselves. For the Spirit of God bears witness to the elect that they are the children of God, Rom. 8, 16. And if at any time they fall into such strong temptations, that they think they no more perceive the power of the indwelling Spirit of God, and say with David, Psalm 31, 22: "I said in my haste, I am cut off from before thine eyes;" yet, as David immediately adds, they should say again with him, whatever they may discover in themselves: "Nevertheless thou heardest the voice of my supplications, when I cried unto thee."

And since our election to eternal life is not founded upon our piety or virtue, but alone upon the merit of Christ and the gracious will of his Father, who cannot deny himself, because he is immutable in his will and essence; therefore, if his children fall from obedience and stumble, he causes them to be called again unto repentance, through the Word; and the Holy Spirit will be efficacious in them unto con-

version, through the Word; and when they return unto him again in true repentance, through genuine faith, he will ever manifest his paternal love towards all those who tremble at his word, (Isa. 66, 2,) and return unto him with their hearts. For thus it is written: "If a man put away his wife, and she go from him and become another man's, shall he return unto her again? shall not that land be greatly polluted: but thou hast played the harlot with many lovers; yet return again to me, saith the Lord," Jer. 3, 1.

But the declaration that "no man can come to Christ, except the Father draw him," John 6, 44, is righteously and truly made. The Father, however, will draw no one without means; but he has instituted his Word and Sacraments as the ordinary means and instruments, for this purpose. And it is not the will of the Father or of the Son, that any person should neglect the preaching of his Word, or condemn it, and wait until the Father draws, without the Word and the Sacraments. For the Father draws indeed by the power of his Holy Spirit, yet according to his ordinary mode, through the hearing of his holy, divine Word, as with a net, by which the elect are snatched out of the jaws of Satan. And to the preaching of this Word, each miserable sinner should betake himself, hear it diligently, and not doubt the drawing of the Father. For the Holy Spirit with his power will accompany the word, and operate through it: and this is the drawing of the Father.

But the reason that all who hear the Word of God, do not believe, and therefore meet with a deeper condemnation, is not found in God's unwillingness to bestow salvation; but they themselves are in fault, because they so hear the Word, not to learn, but only to scorn, to blaspheme, and to profane it, and because they resisted the Holy Spirit, who desires to operate in them through the Word; as was the case with the Pharisees and their adherents in the time of Christ. Hence the Apostle distinguishes with special diligence the work of God,—who makes vessels of honor alone,—from the work of the devil and of man, who by the impulse of the devil, and not of God, has made himself a vessel of dishonor. For thus it is written: "God endured with much long-suffering the vessels of wrath fitted to destruction; that he might make known the riches of his glory on the vessels of mercy, which he had afore prepared unto glory," Rom. 9, 22, 23.

For here the Apostle clearly asserts, that God endured the vessels of wrath with much long-suffering, but he does not say, that God made them vessels of wrath. For, if this had been the will of God, there would have been no need for long-suffering. But it is

the fault of the devil and those individuals themselves, and not of God, that they are fitted to destruction.

For, every preparation or fitting to destruction proceeds from the devil and men, through sin, and by no means from God, who does not desire that any man should be damned ; how then should he himself fit or prepare any person for damnation ? For, as God is not a cause of sin, so he is also no cause of the punishment, that is, damnation ; but the only cause of damnation is sin. “ For the wages of sin is death,” Rom. 6, 23. And, as God neither desires the commission of sin nor has pleasure in it, so he likewise neither desires the death of the sinner nor has pleasure in his damnation. “ For he is not willing that any should perish, but that all should come to repentance,” 2 Pet. 3, 9. For thus it is written : “ For I have no pleasure in the death of him that dieth,” Ezek. 18, 23, 32. “ As I live, saith the Lord God, I have no pleasure in the death of the wicked ; but that the wicked turn from his way and live,” ch. 33, 11. And St. Paul testifies in definite terms, that out of vessels of dishonor, vessels of honor may be made through the power and operation of God ; when he writes thus : “ If a man, therefore, purge himself from these, he shall be a vessel unto honor, sanctified, and meet for the master’s use, and prepared unto every good work,” 2 Tim. 2, 21. For he that purges himself, must previously have been impure, and consequently have been a vessel of dishonor. But concerning the vessels of mercy he asserts clearly, that the Lord himself has prepared them for glory,—which he does not say in reference to the damned, who themselves, and not God, have made themselves vessels of damnation.

It must also be carefully observed, when God punishes sin by sin—that is, in the case of those who had been converted, on account of their subsequent security, impenitence, and wanton sins, punishes with hardness of heart and blindness of mind—that this is not to be so understood, as if it had never been God’s gracious will that such persons should come to the knowledge of the truth, and be saved. For this is the revealed will of God :

First, that God will receive all those in grace, who repent, and believe in Christ.

Second, that he will also punish those who wilfully turn away from his holy commands, and entangle themselves again in the pollutions of the world, 2 Pet. 2, 20 ; garnish their hearts unto Satan, Luke 11, 25 ; do despite unto the Holy Spirit, Heb. 10, 29, and that such, if they persevere in these things, shall be hardened, blinded, and eternally damned.

Accordingly, Pharaoh, (concerning whom it is written : “ Even for this same purpose have I raised thee up, that I might show my power in thee, and that my name might be declared throughout all the earth,” Exod. 9, 16 ; Rom. 9, 17,) did not perish because God would not grant him salvation, or because it was the pleasure and will of God that he should be damned and lost. *For God is not willing that any should perish ; nor has he any pleasure in the death of the wicked ; but that the wicked turn from his way and live,* 2 Pet. 3, 9 ; Ezek. 33, 11.

But when God hardened the heart of Pharaoh, so that Pharaoh persisted in the perpetration of sins, and became the more obdurate the more he was admonished, all this was a punishment of his former sins, and of the atrocious tyranny which he had in very many instances, practised most inhumanly in the case of the children of Israel, and contrary to the reproaches of his own conscience. And inasmuch as God caused his Word to be preached and his will to be declared to him, and Pharaoh nevertheless wilfully rebelled against all these admonitions and warnings, God abandoned him, and thus his heart was hardened, and God executed his judgment upon him ; for he deserved nothing else than hell-fire. Indeed, the holy Apostle introduces the example of Pharaoh, only to show the justice of God administered in the case of the impenitent and the despisers of his Word. But it is by no means the meaning of Paul that God would not grant him, or any other man, salvation, nor that in his secret counsel he had ordained him to eternal damnation, so that he neither could nor might be saved.

By this doctrine and explanation of the eternal and saving election of the elect children of God, the honor of God is wholly and fully attributed unto him, namely, that through pure mercy in Christ, without any of our merits or good works, he saves us according to the purpose of his will ; as it is written : “ Having predestinated us unto the adoption of children, by Jesus Christ, to himself, according to the good pleasure of his will, to the praise of the glory of his grace wherein he hath made us accepted in the Beloved,” Eph. 1, 5, 6. The following doctrine, is, therefore, false and erroneous, namely, that not the mercy of God alone, and the most holy merit of Christ are the cause, but that in us also there is a cause of the election of God, on account of which God has elected us to everlasting life. For, not only before we had done any good, but also before we were born, yea, before the foundation of the world, he elected us in Christ ; “ That the purpose of God, according to election might stand, not of works, but of him that calleth, it was said

unto her, The elder shall serve the younger: As it is written, Jacob have I loved, but Esau, have I hated," Rom. 9, 11, 12, 13; Gen. 25, 23; Mal. 1, 2, 3.

In like manner, this doctrine gives no one occasion either to despond, or to lead a dissolute and wicked life, when, namely, people are taught that they must seek eternal election in Christ and his holy Gospel, as in the book of life. For the Gospel excludes no penitent sinner, but calls and invites all poor, all troubled and afflicted sinners to repentance, to the acknowledgment of their sins, and to faith in Christ; it promises the Holy Spirit for their purification and renovation. And thus this article affords to troubled and agitated minds the surest consolation, since thereby they know that their salvation is not entrusted to their hands, else they would lose it much more easily than Adam and Eve lost it in Paradise, and that too, every hour and moment, but that it depends on the gracious election of God, which he has revealed unto us in Christ, out of whose hand no one shall pluck us, John 10, 28; 2 Tim. 2, 19.

Wherefore, if any one inculcates this doctrine concerning the gracious election of God, in such a manner that distressed Christians cannot console themselves by it, but are rather led into despair, or that the impenitent are encouraged in their wickedness, it is undoubtedly certain and true, that this doctrine is set forth, not according to the Word and will of God, but according to mere human reason and the suggestions of the devil.

"For whatsoever things were written aforetime," as the Apostle testifies, "were written for our learning, that we, through patience and comfort of the Scriptures, might have hope," Rom. 15, 4. But where this comfort and hope are impaired, or taken away from us entirely by the Scripture, it is certain, that the Scripture is understood and explained contrary to the will and meaning of the Holy Spirit.

To this simple, perspicuous, and profitable explanation, which has a good and sure foundation in the revealed will of God, we adhere, and we shun and avoid all refined, curious, and useless speculations and questions. And whatever is contrary to these simple and profitable explanations, we reject and condemn.

And thus let this suffice concerning the controverted articles, which were discussed for a number of years among the theologians of the Augsburg Confession, in which some have erred; whence grave controversies or religious contentions arose.

From this our Declaration, friends, foes, and all, can clearly perceive, that it is not our purpose, for the sake of temporal peace,

tranquillity, and union, to make any concession that might prove detrimental to the eternal, immutable truth of God, (which indeed it does not lie within our power to do,) nor would that peace and union, which is adverse to the truth, and tends to a suppression of it, have any permanence; much less are we disposed to commend or to connive at any corruption of the pure doctrine, or at manifest and condemned errors. But that union we love and delight in, and cordially and earnestly desire on our part, according to our utmost abilities, to promote, by which the honor of God is not violated, the divine truth of the holy Gospel not in any point impaired, the least error not countenanced, but by which, poor sinners are brought to true and genuine repentance, strengthened by faith, confirmed in new obedience, and thus justified and eternally saved through the merit of Christ alone.

XII. OF SEVERAL FACTIONS AND SECTS,

WHICH HAVE NEVER EMBRACED THE AUGSBURG CONFESSION.

The names of those sects and factions which never adopted the Augsburg Confession, have not been expressly mentioned in this Declaration; as, for instance, the Anabaptists, the Schwenkfeldians, the New Arians, and the Antitrinitarians. The errors of these have been unanimously condemned by all the churches of the Augsburg Confession. But we did not wish to speak concerning these errors in this treatise, unless incidentally, because at this time our chief object has been to refute the calumnies of our Popish adversaries.

For, without any sense of shame, they have defamed our churches and our teachers in all the world, proclaiming that no two preachers can be found who agree in each and every article of the Augsburg Confession; but that they are so divided among each other that they themselves do not understand the Augsburg Confession and its proper sense. We have, therefore, desired to make a declaration concerning our agreement, not by merely employing a few words or names, but by giving a pure, perspicuous, and direct explanation concerning all such articles as have been discussed and controverted by the theologians of the Augsburg Confession; so that all may see that we do not attempt to conceal or cover over any of these things in an artful manner, or agree with each other only in appearance; but that we wish to settle the matter in reality, and so to set forth our views, that even our adversaries themselves must confess that in all these things we adhere to the true, simple, natural, and proper

sense of the Augsburg Confession ; in which, through the grace of God, we desire to persevere steadfastly, until the end of our days ; and, so far as it depends on our service, we shall neither connive at it, nor keep silence, if any thing contrary to this Confession be introduced into our churches and schools, in which the Almighty God and Father of our Lord Jesus Christ, has appointed us to be teachers and pastors.

Lest the condemned errors of the aforementioned factions and sects should be tacitly attributed to us, we could not forbear to testify even publicly before the whole Christian community, that we have no part nor communion with these errors, whether they be few or many, but that we reject and condemn them altogether, as wrong and heretical, and contrary to the Prophetic and Apostolic Scriptures, and to our Christian Augsburg Confession, which is firmly established on the Word of God. And these errors, indeed, for the most part, have insinuated themselves secretly in those places and especially at those times, (according to the manner of fanatical spirits,) wherein neither room nor place is given for the pure Word of the holy Gospel, while all its righteous teachers and professors are persecuted. For, where the thick darkness of Popery still reigns, there, alas ! poor, simple men, who must perceive the manifest idolatry and false faith of Popery, embrace in their simplicity, whatever disagrees with the Popish doctrines, and is obtruded under the name of the Gospel !

ERRONEOUS ARTICLES OF THE ANABAPTISTS.

We reject the erroneous, heretical doctrines of the Anabaptists—doctrines which cannot be tolerated in the ecclesiastical, or in the civil, or in the domestic relations of life ; namely :

1. That our righteousness before God consists, not in the obedience and merits of Christ alone, but in our renewal, and in our own piety in which we walk before God. But this righteousness of the Anabaptists is, for the most part, founded on their own particular ordinances, and on a sanctimoniousness, devised by themselves, as on a new system of monastic life.

2. That infants, which are not baptized, are not sinners in the sight of God, but are righteous and innocent, and that consequently in their innocence they are saved without baptism, of which they have no need. Thus they deny and reject the whole doctrine concerning original sin, and all that is connected with it.

3. That infants are not to be baptized, until they attain the use of their reason, and are able to make a confession of faith themselves.

4. That the children of Christians, since they are born of Christian and believing parents, are holy and the children of God, even with-

out and prior to baptism. For this reason they do not highly esteem Infant Baptism, nor promote it; contrary to the express words of the promise of God, which extends to those alone who keep his covenant and do not despise it, Gen. 17, 9, 10.

5. That a church or a congregation in which sinners are yet found, is not a true Christian church.

6. That no one should frequent a temple, or hear a sermon in it, in which the Papistical mass had previously been celebrated.

7. That no one should have any intercourse with the ministers of the church, who preach the holy Gospel according to the Augsburg Confession, and rebuke the errors of the Anabaptists; and that no one should serve them or labor for them, but flee from them, and shun them as perverters of the Word of God.

8. That the office of a magistrate is not a condition of life pleasing to God, under the New Testament dispensation.

9. That a Christian cannot hold the office of a magistrate with a good and inviolate conscience.

10. That a Christian may not, with an inviolate conscience, exercise the office of magistrate, where the case requires it, against the wicked; nor may subjects invoke that power with which the magistrates are invested, for their protection.

11. That a Christian cannot, with a good conscience, swear an oath before a tribunal, nor take the oath of fealty to his prince or sovereign.

12. That the magistracy cannot, with an inviolate conscience, inflict capital punishment on malefactors.

13. That a Christian can neither hold nor possess any property as his own, with a good conscience, but is under obligation to have all things common.

14. That a Christian cannot, with a good conscience, be a landlord, nor a merchant, nor an armorer.

15. That married people may, on account of a difference in their faith, separate from each other, and each party may contract marriage with another of the same faith.

16. That Christ did not derive his body and blood from the Virgin Mary, but brought the same from heaven with him.

17. That he is not true, essential God, but possesses only more and higher gifts and glory, than other men have.

And other similar articles we reject also. For the Anabaptists are divided into many parties among themselves, attached to a greater or less number of errors; and thus their whole sect is nothing else in reality, but a new monastic system.

ERRONEOUS ARTICLES OF THE SCHWENKFELDIANS.

We also reject and condemn the errors of the Schwenkfeldians, namely :

1. That all those who regard Christ as a creature according to the flesh, or to his assumed humanity, have no right knowledge of Christ the reigning King of heaven ; that the flesh of Christ, through his exaltation, has so assumed all the divine properties, as to be equal in might, power, majesty, and glory, with the Father and the eternal Word in degree and condition of the essence ; so that both natures in Christ are of one and the same essence, property, will, and glory ; and that the flesh of Christ belongs to the essence of the holy Trinity.

2. That the ministry in the church,—the preached and heard Word,—is not an instrument through which God, the Holy Spirit, teaches men, and produces in them the saving knowledge of Christ, conversion, repentance, faith, and new obedience.

3. That the water in Baptism, is not a medium through which God the Lord seals our adoption as children, and effects regeneration.

4. That bread and wine in the holy sacrament of the Lord's Supper, are not the means through which Christ distributes his body and blood.

5. That a Christian who is truly regenerated through the Spirit of God, can keep and fulfil the law of God perfectly in this life.

6. That the church in which there is no public excommunication, or in which no regular process of excommunication is observed, is not a true Christian church.

7. That the minister of the church, who is not truly renewed, righteous, and pious, in his own person, cannot teach other persons profitably, or administer true and genuine sacraments to them.

ERROR OF THE NEW ARIANS.

We likewise reject and condemn the erroneous doctrine of the New Arians, who teach, that Christ is not true, essential, natural God, of one eternal, divine essence with God the Father, but is only adorned with divine majesty, subordinate and next to God the Father.

ERRONEOUS ARTICLES OF THE NEW ANTITRINITARIANS.

1. Again, some Antitrinitarians reject and condemn the ancient, approved Symbols, the Nicene and the Athanasian, both as to their meaning and their expressions, and teach, that there is not one, only, eternal, divine essence of the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit, but that

even as God the Father, Son, and Holy Spirit are three distinct persons, so also each person has his essence distinct and separate from the other persons. Some of them hold that all these three,—like three different men separated from each other in their essence,—are of the same power, wisdom, majesty, and glory; but others of them hold the three persons to be unequal in essence and properties to each other.

2. That the Father alone is true God.

These, and all similar articles, and all that belongs to, or results from these, we condemn and reject as wrong, false, and heretical, and as repugnant to the Word of God, to the three Symbols, to the Augsburg Confession and Apology, to the Smalcald Articles, and to the Catechisms of Luther; against which errors all pious Christians should carefully guard, as they value the salvation of their souls.

In the presence of God, therefore, and before the whole Christian church, we have desired to testify to those who now live, and to those who shall come after us, that this Declaration now made, concerning all the controverted articles already mentioned and explained, and no other, is our faith, doctrine, and confession; in which, by the grace of God, we shall appear with humble confidence before the judgment-seat of Jesus Christ, and render an account for the same. After mature deliberation, in the fear of God, and invoking his name, we have subscribed this Declaration with our own hands; * contrary to which we will neither write nor speak any thing, either secretly or publicly, but, supported by the grace of God, we shall firmly adhere to the doctrines inculcated in it.

* The list of names, to which reference is here made, covering 73 pages, small 4to, (Weisz's edition of 1739,) and closely printed in 3 columns on each page, it was not deemed essential to append to this translation of the Book of Concord, since the authority of the latter, as the confession of the church, is acknowledged. The list comprehends the names of 3 electors, 20 princes, 24 earls or counts, (*Grafen*), 4 barons, (*Freiherren*), the magistrates of 38 imperial cities, and about 8000 professors, theologians, and teachers, or representatives of churches, &c., that is, of those only who subscribed previous to the issue of the first edition.—[TRANS.]

APPENDIX.

A CATALOGUE OF TESTIMONIES

OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE AND OF THE ANCIENT, PURE TEACHERS OF THE CHURCH;
EXHIBITING BOTH THEIR DOCTRINE AND ALSO THEIR PHRASEOLOGY IN
REFERENCE TO THE PERSON AND THE DIVINE MAJESTY OF
THE HUMAN NATURE OF OUR LORD JESUS CHRIST, WHO IS
SEATED AT THE RIGHT HAND OF THE ALMIGHTY
POWER OF GOD.

APPENDIX.

TO THE CHRISTIAN READER.

Inasmuch as some have intimated without any grounds, that in the Book of Concord there is a deviation in phrases and forms of expression from the ancient, orthodox churches and Fathers, especially in the article concerning the person of Christ, and that, on the contrary, new, strange, self-devised, unusual, and unheard-of expressions are introduced; and since the testimonies of the ancient churches and Fathers, to which this book has reference, are somewhat too extended to be embodied in it, (which testimonies were afterwards presented to several princes and electors, accurately marked out,) we have arranged them under different heads, and appended them to this book, for the benefit of the Christian reader; from these testimonies he may perceive and readily discover, that nothing new, either in doctrine or in the form and manner of expression, has been introduced into the said book, but that this mystery is taught and treated even in the same manner as, first of all, the holy Scripture and afterwards the ancient, orthodox church, have taught.

Thus, in the first place, the fact that in the Book of Concord, in treating of the unity of the person of Christ, and of the difference between his two natures, as well as of their essential attributes, no deviation has been made from the manner in which the ancient, orthodox church, the Fathers of the same, and the councils, have spoken concerning these points; namely, that there are not two persons, but *one Christ*, and in this person two distinct natures, the *divine* and the *human*, which are neither separated nor commingled, nor changed the one into the other, but that each nature has and retains its essential attributes, and does not lay them off in eternity; and that the essential attributes of the one nature, which are truly and rightly ascribed to the whole person, never become the attributes of the other nature, the following testimonies of the ancient, pure councils prove:

In Ephesino Concilio, (tom. 1, concil. p. 606,) can. 4: Si quis voces scripturæ de Christo in duabus personis vel subsistentiis dividit, et aliquas quidem velut homini, qui præter *Dei Verbum* specialiter intelligatur, aptaverit, aliquas vero tamquam dignas *Deo soli Dei Patris* verbo deputaverit, anathema sit.

Canone 5: Si quis audeat dicere: Hominem *Christum* theophoron ac non potius *Deum* esse, tamquam Filium per naturam veraciter dixerit, secundum quod Verbum caro factum est, et communicarit similiter ut nos carni et sanguini, anathema sit.

Canone 6: Si quis non confitetur eundem *Christum Deum* simul et hominem, propterea quod *Verbum* caro factum est, secundum scripturas, anathema sit.

Canone 12: Si quis non confitetur *Dei* Verbum passum carne, et crucifixum carne, et mortem carne gustasse, factumque primogenitum ex mortuis, secundum quod vita et vivificator est *ut Deus*, anathema sit.

That is:—In the fourth canon or rule of the Council of Ephesus it is thus concluded: If any one should divide the declarations of Scripture concerning Christ between two persons or substances, and apply some of them to man, who should be understood independently of the Father's Word, or without the Son of God, and ascribe others to the Son of God alone, as pertaining only to God, let him be accursed.

In the fifth canon, thus: If any one should dare to assert, that the man Christ bears God, and not much rather truly say that he is God, as the natural Son of God, accordingly as the Word was made flesh, and partook even as we do, of flesh and blood, let him be accursed.

In the sixth: If any one should not confess, that the one Christ is both God and man, because the Word was made flesh, according to the Scripture, let him be accursed.

In the twelfth: If any one should not confess that the Word of God suffered in the flesh, and was crucified in the flesh, and tasted death in the flesh, and that he became the first-born from the dead, according as he is life, and life-giving, as God, let him be accursed.

Et decretum Chalcedonensis Concilii citante Evagrio, lib. 2, cap. 4, sic habet: Sequentes igitur sanctos patres, confitemur unum et eundem Filium, Dominum nostrum *Jesum Christum*, et una voce omnes deprædicamus, eundem perfectum in Divinitate et perfectum eundem in humanitate, vere Deum et vere hominem eundem, ex anima rationali et corpore, consubstantiali Patri secundum Divinitatem, et consubstantiali nobis secundum humanitatem, per omnia nobis similem absque peccato, ante sæcula quidem ex Patre genitum secundum Divinitatem, in extremis autem diebus ipsum eundem propter nos et propter nostram salutem ex Maria virgine, Dei genetrice secundum humanitatem genitum, unum et eundem *Jesum Christum*, Filium et Dominum unigenitum, in duabus naturis inconfuse, inconvertibiliter, indivise, insepregabiliter cognitum, nequaquam differentia

naturarum sublata propter unionem, *sed* servata *potius* proprietate utriusque naturæ, et utraque in unam personam concurrente, non velut in duas personas dispertitum aut divisum, sed unum et eundem Filium unigenitum, Deum, Verbum et Dominum Jesum Christum; quemadmodum olim prophetæ et de se ipso Christus ipse nos docuit, et patrum nobis tradidit symbolum, (tom. 1, concil. p. 154.)

That is:—And the decree of the Council of Chalcedon says: We follow, therefore, the holy Fathers, and confess one and the same Son, our Lord Jesus Christ, and with one voice we teach that he is perfect in his divinity, and perfect in his humanity, truly God, and truly man, who has a rational soul and a body, consubstantial with the Father according to his divinity, and consubstantial with us according to his humanity; similar to us in all things, sin excepted; begotten of the Father before the beginning of time, according to his divinity; but in the last days even this same one was born for us and on account of our salvation, of the Virgin Mary, the mother of God, according to his humanity, one and the same *Jesus Christ*, the only-begotten Son and Lord, known in two natures unconfused, unchangeable, undivided, inseparable; the difference of natures by no means destroyed on account of this union, *but rather* the properties of each nature being preserved, and concurring in one person, not as separated or divided in two persons, but one and the same only-begotten Son, God, Word, and Lord Jesus Christ, &c.

Ita etiam decima epistola Leonis synodica (Ad Flavianum cap. 3, fol. 92,) loquitur: Salva proprietate utriusque naturæ et in unam coeunte personam, suscepta est a majestate humilitas, a virtute infirmitas, ab æternitate mortalitas,* et ad resolvendum conditionis nostræ debitum, natura inviolabilis naturæ est unita passibili, ut unus et idem mediator noster et mori posset ex uno, et mori non posset ex altero.

Item (cap. 4, fol. 93.): Qui verus est Deus, idem verus est homo, dum invicem sunt et humilitas hominis et altitudo Deitatis. Sicut enim Deus non inutatur miseratione, ita homo non consumitur dignitate, agit enim utraque forma cum alterius communione, quod proprium est, Verbo scilicet operante, quod Verbi est, et carne exsequente, quod carnis est. Unum horum coruscat miraculis, alterum succumbit injuriis. Deus est per id, quod in principio erat Verbum, et Deus erat Verbum, per quod omnia facta sunt. Homo per id, quod Verbum caro factum est, quodque factus est ex muliere. Item propter hanc unitatem personæ in utraque natura intelligendam, et

* Abstractum pro concreto.

filius hominis legitur descendisse de cœlo, quum Filius Dei ex Maria virgine carnem assumerit.

Et rursus (cap. 5, fol. 93,) : Filius Dei crucifixus dicitur et sepultus, quum hæc non in ipsa Divinitate, qua consubstantialis est Patri, sed in naturæ humanæ sit infirmitate perpeusus, cet.

That is :—Thus also the tenth epistle of Leo, which was of great influence in the Council of Chalcedon, speaks : The properties of each nature secured, and meeting in one person, humility was received by majesty, infirmity by power, mortality by immortality ; and, for abolishing the debt of our condition, a nature incapable of suffering was united with a nature capable of suffering ; so that this same Mediator whom we have, might be able to die according to one nature, but not according to the other.

Again : He who is true God, is also true man, because the humility of man and the greatness of the Deity, are in union. For as God, in Christ, is not changed by compassion, so the Man in him is not consumed by the divine dignity ; for each form, in communion with the other, performs that which is peculiar to itself ; the WORD indeed working that which is of the WORD, and the Flesh performing that which is of the flesh. One of these shines with miracles, the other succumbs to injuries. He is God because the WORD was in the beginning, and God was the WORD, by whom all things were made. He is man because the WORD was made flesh, and because he was made of a woman. Again : In order to express this union of person in both natures, we read in the Scriptures that the Son of man descended from heaven, when the Son of God assumed flesh from the Virgin Mary ; and again :

The Son of God, is said to have been crucified and buried, although he endured these things not to his divinity, which is consubstantial with the Father, but in the infirmity of his assumed human nature, &c.

These are the the words of the two councils, of Ephesus and Chalcedon ; and with these all the holy Fathers accord.

And even this the learned have also hitherto in our schools desired to show and to explain by the words *abstractum* and *concretum*, abstract and concrete, to which the Book of Concord has reference in these few words : “ All this the learned well know.” * And the words *abstract* and *concrete* must necessarily be preserved in the schools in their proper sense.

For, *concrete words* are those which designate the whole person in Christ ; as, *God, man*. But *abstract words* are those by which

* Book of Concord, page 693.

the natures in the person of Christ are understood and expressed ; as, *divinity, humanity.*

According to this distinction it is correctly said, concretely : *God is man, man is God.* On the contrary, it is incorrect to say, in abstract terms : *Divinity is humanity, humanity is divinity.*

And the same is applicable to the essential attributes ; so that the attributes of the one nature cannot be predicated of the other nature *abstractly*, as if they were the attributes of that other nature too. Hence, to say, *the human nature is omnipotence, or is from eternity*, would be false and erroneous. Nor can the attributes themselves be predicated of one another, as if it should be said : *Mortality is immortality, and immortality is mortality* ; for, by such expressions the difference between the natures and their attributes would be destroyed, and they would be commingled, the one would be changed into the other, and thus they would be equalized.

But it is necessary to know and firmly to believe, not only that the assumed human nature in the person of Christ, has and retains to all eternity its essence and its natural, essential attributes, but as it is also of special importance, and as the highest consolation of a Christian is comprehended in it, to know also from the revelation of the holy Scripture, and to believe without any doubt, to what majesty his human nature was really and actually raised, in and through the personal union, and thus became a personal partaker of the same,—all of which is amply explained in the Book of Concord,—therefore, in order that all may see, that in the said book no new, strange, unheard-of phrases and expressions devised by men, have been introduced on this subject into the church of God, the following catalogue of testimonies, first of the holy Scriptures and then of the ancient, orthodox teachers of the church, but especially of those Fathers who were the chief and leading men of the four general councils, clearly demonstrate the point from which it may be perceived in what manner they discoursed on this matter.

And in order that the Christian reader may the more easily comprehend this matter and judge of it, these testimonies are arranged under several different heads, which follow.

I.

In the first place, that the holy Scriptures as also the Fathers, when speaking of the majesty which the human nature of Christ has received through the personal union, employ the words, *communicatio, communio, participatio, traditio, donatio, subjectio, exaltatio, dari, &c.* ; that is, communication, communion, participation, to be given, &c.

Dan. 7, 13, 14: Ecce in nubibus cœli quasi filius hominis veniebat, cet., et *dedit* ei potestatem, honorem et regnum. Potestas ejus potestas æterna.

Joh. 13, 3: Sciens, quia omnia *dedit* ei Pater in manus.

Matt. 11, 27: Omnia mihi *tradita* sunt a Patre meo.

Matt. 28, 18: *Data* est mihi omnis *potestas* in cœlo et in terra.

Phil. 2, 9: *Donavit* ei nomen super *omne* nomen, cet.

Eph. 1, 22: Omnia *subjecit* sub pedibus ejus.

Ps. 8, 6; 1 Cor. 15, 27; Ebr. 2, 8; Phil. 2, 9: Propter quod Deus *exaltavit* ipsum.

That is:—Daniel 7, 13, 14: I saw,—and, behold, one like the Son of man came with the clouds of heaven, and came to the Ancient of days, and they brought him near before him. And there was given him dominion, and glory, and a kingdom, that all people, nations, and languages, should serve him: his dominion is an everlasting dominion, which shall not pass away, and his kingdom that which shall not be destroyed.

John 13, 3: Jesus knowing that the Father had given all things into his hands.

Matt. 11, 27: All things are delivered unto me of my Father.

Matt. 28, 18: All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth.

Phil. 2, 9: God also hath highly exalted him, and given him a name which is above every name, &c.

Eph. 1, 22: And hath put all things under his feet; 1 Cor. 15, 27; Heb. 2, 8.

EUSEBIUS (Demonstr. Evang. 1, 4, c. 13, p. 169, ed. Paris, 1628.): Sed illa quidem a se ipso *communicans* (ο Λογος) homini, hæc vero a mortali ipse non recipiens. Item, mortali quidem potentiam divinam subministrans, a mortali vero ipse non contra in partem aut communitatem adductus.

Idem: Hunc ipsum interim ad illius vitæ æternæ, quam penes se habet, atque ad dignitatis in Divinitate ac beatitudine *communitatum* assumens.

That is:—The WORD imparting these things indeed from his own to man, but not receiving those from the mortal, and furnishing divine power to the mortal, but not taken by the mortal into a share or participation.

The WORD made him (man) worthy of partaking of the Divinity, and of life eternal, and of blessedness.

ATHANASIUS in Epistola ad Epictetum (tom. 1, op. p. 589, ed. Colon.) referente etiam Epiphanio contra Dimeritas (Hæres. 77 contra Dimæritas t. 2, op. p. 1005, ed. Col.): Non enim Verbum caro

factum est, ut Deitati aliqua accessio fieret, neque ut Verbum in meliorem statum reduceretur, magis vero ipsi humanæ naturæ accessio magna facta est ex communione et unione Verbi ad humanam naturam.

That is:—For the WORD was not made flesh for the purpose of adding any thing to the Deity, nor for the purpose of placing the WORD in a better condition; but much rather was there a great accession made to the human nature itself, by the communion and union of the WORD with the human nature.

EPIPHANIUS Hæresi 69, (contra Ariomanitas,) p. 344 (p. 805, ed. Col.): Caro, quæ ex Maria et ex nostro genere erat, transformabatur in gloriam (in transfiguratione) insuper acquirens gloriam Deitatis, honorem, perfectionem et gloriam cœlestem, quam caro ab initio non habebat, sed ibi eam in *cognitione* scilicet Dei Verbi acceperat.

That is:—The flesh, which was from Mary, and was of our race, was transformed into glory, (by transfiguration,) and obtained, moreover, the glory of the Deity—that honor, perfection, and heavenly glory, which the flesh had not from the beginning, but which it has received by its co-union with God, the WORD.

CYRILLUS, lib. 5, Dialog. (t. 5, p. 562, ed. Par. 1638.): Quomodo ergo vivificat caro Christi? Et respondet, secundum unionem cum vivente Verbo, quod et suæ naturæ bona proprio corpori *communia* solet facere.

That is:—How, then, does the flesh of Christ vivify? He answers: Through its union with the living WORD, which WORD is wont to communicate the excellencies of his nature to his own body.

THEODORETUS, Eph. 1 (t. 3, p. 297, ed. Par. 1642.): Quod vero assumpta ex nobis natura ejusdem honoris cum eo, qui assumpsit, *sit particeps*, ut nulla videatur adorationis differentia, sed per naturam, quæ cernitur, adoretur, quæ non cernitur, Divinitas, hoc vero omne miraculum superat.

That is:—But that the nature assumed from us, becomes a partaker of his honor who assumed it, so that no difference of adoration is discerned, but that through the nature which is perceived, the Divinity is adored which is not perceived,—this surpasses all miracles.

DAMASCENUS, lib. 3, περὶ ὁρθοδόξ. π. 7 et 15: Divina natura proprias suas excellentias seu glorificationes carni *communicat* seu *impartit*, ipsa vero in se passionum carnis manet expers.

Idem cap. 19: Caro operanti Deitati Verbi *communicat*, cum quod divinæ operationes per corpus tamquam per organum perficiantur, tum quod unus et idem sit, qui divina et humana operetur. Nosse enim oportet, quod sicuti sancta ejus mens etiam naturales

suas operationes operatur, cet. Et simul *communicat* etiam Deitati Verbi operanti et gubernanti, ipsa etiam intelligens, cognoscens et disponens totum universum, non ut nuda hominis mens, sed ut Deo secundum hypostasim *counita*, et Dei mens constituta.

That is:—The divine nature communicates or imparts its own excellence or glorification to the flesh, but that nature in itself remains free from the affections of the flesh.

The flesh shares with the operating Deity of the WORD, because divine operations are performed through the body as through an organ, and also because he who performs divine and human operations, is one and the same being. For it ought to be observed, that even as his holy mind performs its own natural operations, &c., at the same time this holy mind shares in the operation and government of the Divinity of the WORD, knowing, observing, and arranging the whole universe, not as the limited mind of man, but as a mind personally united with God, being the mind of God.

II.

That Christ has received this majesty in time, not, however, according to his divinity or divine nature, but according to his assumed human nature, or to his flesh, as man, or as the Son of man, that is, *humanitus, ratione corporis seu humanitatis, propter carnem quia homo, aut Filius hominis*.

Ebr. 1, 3: Facta purgatione peccatorum *per se ipsum*, sedet ad dexteram majestatis in excelsis.

Ebr. 2, 8, 9: Videmus *Jesum* propter *passionem* mortis gloria et honore coronatum, et constitutum super omnia opera manuum Dei, et omnia ei subjecta sub pedibus ejus.

Luc. 22, 69: Ex hoc erit *filius hominis* sedens a dextris virtutis *Dei*.

Luc. 1, 32, 33: Et dabit *ei* Dominus Deus sedem David patris, et regnabit in æternum, et regni ejus non erit finis.

Joh. 5, 26, 27: Dedit Filio habere vitam in se ipso, et potestatem dedit ei etiam judicium facere, quia *filius hominis est*.

That is:—Heb. 1, 3: Who, when he had by himself purged our sins, sat down on the right hand of the Majesty on high.

Heb. 2, 8, 9: But now we see not yet all things put under him; but we see Jesus, who was made a little lower than the angels, for the suffering of death, crowned with glory and honor.

Luke 22, 69: Hereafter shall the Son of man sit on the right hand of the power of God.

Luke 1, 32, 33: And the Lord God shall give unto him the throne of his father David. And he shall reign over the house of Jacob forever; and of his kingdom there shall be no end.

John 5, 26, 27: For as the Father hath life in himself, so hath he given to the Son to have life in himself; and hath given him authority to execute judgment also, because he is the Son of man.

ATHANASIUS apud Theodoretum, Dialog. 2, p. 330: Quæcumque scriptura dicit Christum in tempore accepisse, propter *humanitatem* dicit, non propter Divinitatem.

That is:—Whatever the Scripture says that Christ has received in time, is said *on account of his humanity*, and not on account of his divinity.

ATHANASIUS, Oratione contra Arianos 2 et 4 (f. 347 et 490, sq. 492, ed. Colon. 1686,): Scriptura non intelligit substantiam Verbi exaltatam, sed ad *humanitatem* ejus hoc spectat, et propter *carnem* exaltari dicitur. Quum enim ipsius sit corpus, merito ipse ut *homo*, *ratione corporis*, *humanitus* exaltari et accipere memoratur, eo quod *corpus* illa recipiat, quæ Verbum semper possidebat, secundum suam ex Patre Deitatem et perfectionem. Dicit igitur se potestatem *accepisse ut hominem*, quam semper habet ut Deus. Dicitque (glorifica me) qui alios glorificat, ut ostendat carnem se habere istarum rerum indigam. Ac proinde *carne suæ humanitatis* hanc glorificationem accipiente, ita loquitur, quasi ipse eam accepisset.

Illud enim ubique animadvertendum, nihil eorum, quæ dicit se accepisse, in tempore scilicet, ita se accepisse, quasi non habuisset; habebat enim illa utpote semper ut Deus et Verbum. Nunc autem dicit *humanitus* se accepisse, ut *carne ejus in ipso accipiente* in posterum ea ex carne illius in nos firmiter possidenda traderentur.

Idem: De suscepta Humanitate contra Apollinarium (p. 603 et 611, ed. Colon. 1686,): Quum Petrus dicit Jesum factum Dominum et Christum a Deo, non de Divinitate ejus loquitur, sed de *humanitate*. Verbum ejus semper erat Dominus, neque post crucem primum factus est Dominus, sed *humanitatem* ejus Divinitas *fecit Dominum et Christum*.

Item: Quæcumque scriptura dicit Filium *accepisse, ratione corporis* accepta intelligit, corpusque illud esse primitias ecclesiæ. Primum igitur Dominus *suum corpus* excitavit et exaltavit, posthac autem membra sui corporis. Quibus verbis Athanasius explicavit, quod paulo post ad universam ecclesiam etiam suo modo accommodavit.

That is:—The Scripture does not understand the substance of the Word to be exalted, but this exaltation relates to his *humanity*, and

on account of the *flesh* he is said to be exalted. For, since it is his body, he himself *as man*, is properly said to be exalted and to receive, in regard to his *humanity by reason of his body*, because this *body* received those endowments which the WORD always possessed, according to his Divinity and perfection which he has of the Father. Therefore, he says that *as man* he has *received* that power which he always had as God. And he, who glorifies others, says "glorify me," in order to show that he himself has *flesh* in need of these endowments. And therefore, *his flesh having received* this glorification according to *his humanity*, he speaks as if he himself had received it.

This must be observed every where in the Scriptures, that none of those things which he says he received, in time namely, he received as if he did not possess them already; for as God and the WORD, he always had them. But now he says that he has *received* these endowments *after the humanity*, so that, *after his flesh in himself had received them*, he might henceforth impart them to us from his flesh as a sure possession.

Again: When Peter says, Jesus was made Lord and Christ, of God, he speaks, not concerning his Divinity, but concerning his *humanity*. His WORD was always Lord; nor was he first made Lord after his crucifixion, but his Divinity made his *humanity Lord and Christ*.

And again: Whatever the Scripture says the Son has *received*, it understands that he received *according to the body*, and that this body is the first fruits of the church. The Lord, therefore, raised and exalted *his body* first; but afterwards the members of his body. By these words Athanasius explains what he, a little afterwards in his way, accommodates even to the whole church.

BASILIIUS MAGNUS contra Eunomium, lib. 4 (p. 769, ed. Paris.): Quod Dominus celebratur et accepit nomen super omne nomen; item: Data est mihi omnis potestas in cælo et in terra, ego vivo propter Patrem, glorifica me ea gloria, quam ante mundum habui apud te, cet., illa intelligere oportet de *Incarnatione* et non de Deitate.

That is:—These declarations: The Lord is exalted and has received a name which is above every name; again: All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; I live by the Father; glorify me with that glory which I had with thee before the world was, &c., must be understood concerning the *Incarnation*, and not concerning the Deity.

AMBROSIIUS, lib. 5, de Fide, cap. 6 (tom. 2, p. 109.): Didicisti, quod omnia sibi ipsi subicere possit secundum operationem utique

Deitatis : disce nunc, quod *secundum carnem* omnia subjecta accipiat, sicut scriptum est Eph. 1 : *Secundum carnem igitur omnia ipsi subjecta traduntur.*

Idem lib. 5, cap. 2 (p. 99,) : Non enim Deus suæ sedis apostolis dat consortium, Christo vero *secundum humanitatem* datur consortium divinæ sedis.

Et cap. 6 (p. 108,) : In Christo communis *secundum carnem* natura prærogativam sed cælestis meruit.

That is :—You have learnt that he can subject all things unto himself, namely according to the operation of the Deity : learn now, that he receives all things in subjection to him *according to the flesh*, as it is written, Eph. 1. According to the flesh, therefore, all things are given in subjection to him.

For God gave not to the Apostles the fellowship of his seat, but to *Christ according to his humanity*, he gave the fellowship of his divine seat.

According to the flesh the common (human) nature in Christ obtained the prerogative of the heavenly seat.

CHRYSOSTOMUS Ebr. 1, serm. 3, p. 117 (tom. 4, homilia 3, p. 1493,) : *Secundum carnem dicens* : Et adoret ipsum omnes angeli Dei.

That is :—The Father commanded that *according to the flesh*, Christ should be adored by all the angels.

THEOPHYLACTUS in Joh. 3 (p. 235, [ed. Paris, 1631, fol. 605,]) : Pater omnia dedit in manum Filii *juxta humanitatem*.

That is :—The Father gave all things into the hands of the Son *according to his human nature*.

ŒCUMENIUS ex Chrysost. Ebr. 1 (tom. 2, op. p. 324, ed. 1631,) : Quatenus Deus est Filius, æternum habet thronum. Thronus tuus, inquit Deus, in sæculum sæculi. Non enim post crucem et passionem hoc honore ut Deus dignus habitus fuit, sed accepit *ut homo*, quod habebat ut Deus. (Et paulo post) : *Ut homo* igitur audit : Sede a dextris meis. Ut enim Deus æternum habet imperium.

That is :—Inasmuch as he is God the Son, he has an everlasting throne. Thy throne, says God, is from everlasting to everlasting. For he was not counted worthy of this honor as God, after his crucifixion and passion, but *as man* he received that which he had as God. (And a little afterwards) : *As man*, therefore, he hears the words : “ Sit thou at my right hand.” For, as God, he has eternal dominion.

CYRILLUS, lib. 9, Thesauri cap. 3 (tom. 2, p. 110,) : In potestatem dominandi *ut homo* ascendit.

Idem lib. 11, cap. 17 : Gloriam suam, quam semper habuit ut

Deus, *ut homo* petiit; nec quia gloriæ propriæ unquam expers fuit, hæc ab eo dicuntur, sed quia in gloriam, quæ sibi semper adest ut Deo, *proprium templum* subducere volebat.

Idem lib. 2, ad Reginas: Accepisse gloriam, potestatem et regnum super omnia, referendum est ad conditiones *humanitatis*.

That is:—To the power of dominion he rose *as man*.

His glory, which he always possessed as God, he sought *as man*; nor are these things said by him because he was ever destitute of his own glory, but because he wished to bring his *own temple* into the glory which is always present with him as God.

The fact that he received glory, power, and dominion over all things, must be referred to the conditions of his *humanity*.

THEODORETUS in Ps. 2 (tom. 1, p. 242,): Christus quum natura Dominus sit ut Deus, etiam ut *homo* universum imperium accipit.

In Ps. 110 (tom. 1, p. 242,): Sede a dextris meis: *humanitus* hoc dictum est. Ut enim Deus sempiternum habet imperium, sic *ut homo* accipit, quod ut Deus habebat. Ut *homo* igitur audit: Sede a dextris meis; nam ut Deus sempiternam habet imperium.

Idem Ebr. 1 (tom. 2, p. 154,): Christus semper accipit ab angelis cultum et adorationem, erat enim semper Deus, jam autem adorant ipsum etiam ut *hominem*.

That is:—Since Christ as God, is Lord by nature, he also *as man* has received universal dominion.

“Sit thou at my right hand;” this is said in reference to his *humanity*. For, since he, as God, has everlasting dominion: so, as man, he has received that which he had as God; therefore, as *man* he hears the declaration: “Sit thou at my right hand;” for as God he has an everlasting kingdom.

Christ always received honor and adoration from the angels; for he was always God. But now they adore him also as *man*.

LEO Epist. 23, (fol. 99, Ep. [23 et 83,] 46 et 97, fol. 261 et 317, ed. Lugd. 1700,) tractans locum Eph. 1, inquit: Dicant adversarii veritatis, quando omnipotens Pater, vel secundum quam *naturam Filium* suum super omnia evexerit, vel cui substantiæ cuncta subjecerit? Deitati enim, ut creatori, semper subjecta fuerunt. Huic si addita potestas, si exaltata sublimitas, minor erat provehente, nec habebat divitias ejus naturæ, cujus indiguit largitate; sed talia sentientem in societatem suam Arius rapit.

Idem Epist. 83 (fol. 134,): Licet Deitatis et humanitatis in Christo una prorsus eademque persona: exaltationem tamen et nomen super omne nomen ad eam intelligimus pertinere formam, quæ ditanda erat tantæ glorificationis augmento. Non enim per incarnationem aliquid

decesserat Verbo, quod ei Patris munere redderetur. *Forma autem servi* humana est humilitas, quæ in gloriam divinæ potestatis *erecta* est, ut nec sine homine divina nec sine Deo agerentur humana.

Ibidem: Quidquid in tempore accepit Christus, *secundum hominem accepit*, cui, quæ non habuit, conferuntur. Nam secundum potentiam Verbi, indifferenter omnia, quæ habet Pater, etiam Filius habet.

That is:—The adversaries of the truth may say, when, or according to which *nature*, did the omnipotent Father elevate his *Son* above all things, or to which substance (nature) did he subject all things to him? For, to the divinity as Creator they were always subject. If power was added to him, if his greatness was still more exalted, he must previously have been less than he who exalted him; neither had he the riches of that nature, the bounty of which he needed. Now, any one entertaining such views Arius claims for his sect.

Again: Although the divinity and the humanity in Christ are entirely one and the same person, yet we understand that the exaltation and the name above every name, pertain to that form which was to be enriched with the increase of so much glory. For through the Incarnation the WORD did not lose any thing which should be given unto him again as a gift of the Father. But the *form* of a *servant* is the humility of man, which was elevated to the glory of divine power; so that without the human nature nothing divine, and without the divine nature, nothing human, should be transacted.

Whatever Christ has received in time, he has received *as man*, upon whom, that which he had not was conferred. For, according to the power of the WORD, the Son also has without any difference, all that which the Father has.

VIGILIUS, lib. 5, contra Eutychen (p. 66, sq. ed. Divion. 1664, 4.): Divina natura non indiget honoribus sublinari, dignitatis profectibus augeri, potestatem cœli et terræ obedientiæ merito accipere. Secundum *carnis naturam* igitur illa *adeptus est*, qui secundum naturam Verbi horum nihil eguit aliquando. Num quid enim potestatem et dominium creaturæ suæ conditor non habebat, ut novissimis temporibus muneris gratia his potiretur?

That is:—The divine nature needed not to be exalted with honors, to be enlarged with accumulations of dignity, to receive the power in heaven and on earth, by the merit of obedience. *According to the nature of the flesh*, therefore, he (Christ) acquired these endowments, who, according to the nature of the WORD, never was in need of them. For, had not the Creator power and dominion over his crea-

ture, insomuch that in the last times he should obtain these as a gift of grace ?

NICEPHORUS, lib. 1, cap. 36 (fol. 86.): *Christus a discipulis in Galileæ monte conspicitur, et ibi a Patre summam potestatem cæli et terræ sibi, juxta humanitatem scilicet, traditam esse confirmat.*

That is:—Christ was seen on the mount in Galilee by his disciples, and there he confirms the truth that the highest power in heaven and in earth was given to him by the Father, namely, *according to his humanity.*

III.

That the holy Scripture first of all, and afterwards the holy Fathers of the ancient and pure church, in treating of this mystery, also employ abstract terms, or such words as expressly designate the human nature in Christ, and refer to it in the personal union ; for instance, that the human nature has received and exercises this majesty in deed and in truth.

Joh. 6, 54, 55: *Caro mea est cibus et sanguis meus vere est potus. Qui manducat meam carnem et bibit meum sanguinem, habet vitam æternam.*

1 Joh. 1, 7: *Sanguis* Jesu Christi, Filii Dei, emundat nos ab omni peccato.

Ebr. 9, 14: *Sanguis* Christi, qui per Spiritum Sanctum se ipsum obtulit immaculatum Deo, emundat conscientiam nostram ab operibus mortuis, ad serviendum Deo viventi.

Matt. 26, 26, 27, 28: Accipite, manducate, hoc est *corpus meum*. Bibite ex hoc omnes, hic est *sanguis meus* novi testamenti.

That is:—John 6, 54, 55: My flesh is meat indeed, and my blood is drink indeed,—Whoso eateth my flesh, and drinketh my blood, hath eternal life.

1 John 1, 7: The blood of Jesus Christ his Son cleanseth us from all sin.

Heb. 9, 14: The blood of Christ, who through the eternal Spirit offered himself without spot to God, shall purge your conscience from dead works to serve the living God.

Matt. 26, 26, 27, 28: Take, eat ; this is my body. Drink ye all of it ; this is my blood of the new testament.

EUSTACHIUS apud Theodoretum, dialogo 2 (p. 40.): Huic igitur prædixit fore, ut sederet (Christus *homo*) in throno sancto, significans sessurum eum in eodem throno cum divinissimo Spiritu, propter Deum inhabitantem in ipso inseparabiliter.

Idem apud Gelasium: *Homo* Christus, qui profecit sapientia, ætate et gratia, rerum universarum imperium accepit.

Idem ibidem: Christus ipso corpore ad proprios venit apostolos dicens: Data est mihi omnis potestas in cælo et in terra; quam potestatem accepit *extrinsecus templum* et non Deus, qui templum illud præcipua pulchritudine ædificavit.

That is:—The human nature of Christ is seated upon the same throne with the divine Spirit, because God dwells inseparably therein.

The *man* Christ, who increased in wisdom, stature, and favor, (Luke 2, 52,) has received dominion over all things.

Christ in his own body came to his own Apostles, (after his resurrection,) saying: All power is given unto me in heaven and in earth; which power the *external Temple* of the eternal Word, and not God (namely, according to his divinity,) who erected that temple with special beauty, has received.

ATHANASIUS de Ariana et Catholica Confessione (tom. 2, op. p. 579, ed. Colon.): Deus non est mutatus in humanam carnem vel substantiam, sed in se ipso, quam assumsit, glorificabat naturam, ut humana, infirma et mortalis caro atque natura *divinam* profecerit in *gloriam*, ita ut omnem potestatem in cælo et in terra habeat, quam, antequam a Verbo assumeretur, non habebat.

Idem (l. c. p. 597 et 603.): De suscepta Humanitate contra Apollinarium (p. 530.): Paulus, Phil. 2, de *templo* loquitur, quod est corpus suum. Non enim qui altissimus est, sed *caro* exaltatur, et *carni* suæ dedit nomen, quod est super omne nomen, ut scilicet in nomine Jesu flectatur omne genu, et omnis lingua confiteatur, quod Jesus Christus sit Dominus in gloria Patris. Et addit regulam generalem: Quando scriptura loquitur de glorificatione Christi, de *carne* loquitur, quæ percepit gloriam. Et quæcunque scriptura dicit accepisse Filium, *ratione humanitatis* illius, non Divinitatis loquitur; ut quum dicit apostolus, quod in Christo habitet omnis plenitudo Deitatis corporaliter, plenitudinem illam *in carne* Christi habitare intelligendum est.

Idem apud Theodoretum, Dialog. 2 (tom. 3, p. 286.): Corpus est, cui dicit Dominus: Sede a dextris meis.

That is:—God is not changed into the human flesh or substance, but he glorified that nature in himself, which he assumed, in order that the human, infirm, and mortal flesh and nature might attain divine *glory*; so that it has all power in heaven and in earth, which, before it was assumed by the Word, it had not.

Paul, Phil. 2, speaks concerning the *Temple* which is *his body*; for not he who is the Most High, but the *flesh* was exalted, and to *his flesh* he gave a name which is above every name, so that at the

name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess that *Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of the Father*. And he adds this general rule: Whenever the Scripture speaks concerning the glorification of Christ, it speaks concerning the *flesh*, which received this glory. And whatever the Scripture says that the Son has received, it says *in view of his humanity*, and not of his divinity; as, for instance, when the Apostle says, that *in Christ dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily*, we must understand that this plenitude dwells *in the flesh* of Christ.

It is the body, to which the Lord says: Sit thou on my right hand.

ATHANASIUS de Incarnatione, sicut citatur apud Cyrillum in defensione anathematismi 8, et in libro de recta fide ad Reginas: Si quis dicat inadorabilem Domini nostri carnem, ut hominis, et non adorandam ut *Domini et Dei carnem*, hunc anathematizat sancta et catholica ecclesia.

Idem (de susc. Human. p. 603, ed. Colon.): Quæcunque scriptura dicit Filium accepisse, *ratione corporis* accepta intelligit, corpusque illud esse primitas ecclesiæ. Primum igitur Dominus *suum corpus* excitavit, et exaltavit, posthac autem et membra sui corporis.

That is:—If any one should say that the flesh of our Lord is not to be adored, as that of man, and that it must not be adored *as the flesh of the Lord and of God*, the holy and Catholic church anathematizes him.

Whatever the Scripture says the Son has received, it understands as received *according to the body*,—and that this body is the first fruits of the church. The Lord, therefore, raised up and exalted *his body* first, but afterwards also the members of his body.

HILARIUS, lib. 9 (p. 136.): Ut ita homo Jesus maneret in gloria Dei Patris, si in Verbi gloriam *caro esset unita*, et gloriam Verbi caro assumpta teneret.*

That is:—That thus the man Christ remained in the glory of God the Father, if the flesh were united in the glory of the WORD, and if the assumed flesh retained the glory of the WORD.

EUSEBIUS EMISSENUS, in homilia feria sexta post pascha (Feria 6, paschatos in homiliis 5, patrum. p. 297.): Qui secundum Divinitatem semper, simul cum Patre et Spiritu Sancto, omnium rerum potestatem habuit, nunc etiam secundum humanitatem omnium rerum *potestatem* accepit, ut *homo* ille, qui nuper passus est, cælo et terræ dominetur, quin hic et ibi facit, quidquid vult.

That is:—He who according to his divinity always possessed at the same time with the Father and the Holy Spirit, power over all

* Concretum pro abstracto.

things, has now also *according to his humanity* received power over all things, so that *the man*, who lately suffered, rules over heaven and earth, and here and there performs whatever he pleases.

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS apud Gelasium et Theodoretum, Dial. 2 (Apud Theodoretum, tom. 2, p. 333,): *Dextera igitur Dei exaltatus (Act. 2, 33). Quis igitur exaltatus est, humilisne an altissimus? Quid autem est humile, nisi humanum? Quid vero aliud præter Divinitatem appellatione altissimi significatur? At Deus exaltatione non indiget, quum sit altissimus. Humanam igitur naturam exaltatam esse dicit apostolus, exaltatam vero, quia Dominus et Christus factus est (homo). Non igitur æternam essentiam Domini verbo, fecit, exprimit apostolus, sed humilis naturæ evectionem ad summam celsitudinem, videlicet ad dexteram Dei. (Et paulo post): Quia dextera Dei, fabricatrix omnium rerum, quæ est ille Dominus, per quem omnia facta sunt, et sine quo nihil eorum, quæ facta sunt, subsistit, hæc ipsa unitum sibi hominem ad propriam extulit celsitudinem per unionem.*

That is:—"Being by the right hand of God exalted," Acts 2, 33. Who then was exalted, the lowly or the highest one? But what is lowly except that which is human? And what else should be signified by the term Most High, besides the Deity? But God needs no exaltation, since he is the highest. The human nature, therefore, says the Apostle, was exalted—exalted indeed, because it (or the man) was made Lord and Christ. Therefore the Apostle does not express the eternal essence (Deity) of the Lord by the words *he made*, but he implies an exaltation of the lowly nature to the highest rank, namely, to the right hand of God. And a little afterwards: Because the right hand of God, the framer of all things, which right hand is the Lord, by whom all things were made, and without whom none of those things which were made, subsist—this right hand exalts the man, united to itself, to its own highness, through the union.

BASILIIUS MAGNUS contra Eunomium, lib. 2, p. 661: Petrus Act. 2, inquit: Dominum et Christum fecit Deus hunc Jesum, quem vos crucifixistis, demonstrativa voce *humanæ* et omnibus visibili ipsius naturæ palam propemodum incumbens seu innitens. (Et paulo post): Quamobrem inquit, quod Deus Dominum et Christum ipsum fecerit, principatum et dominium super omnia a Patre ipsi commissum dicit.

That is:—Peter, Acts 2, 36, says: "God hath made that same (τοῦτον) Jesus whom ye have crucified, both Lord and Christ;" by the demonstrative pronoun (*that same*) he emphatically refers to the *human* nature, which was visible to all. And a little after: When

he says that God made him Lord and Christ, he declares that the Father had committed the authority and dominion over all things to the same human nature.

EPIPHANIUS contra Ariomanitas (p. 327, [t. 1, f. 728, ed. Paris, 1638,]): Hunc igitur Jesum, quem crucifixistis, ut ne relinqueretur sancta in *carne* dispensatio a passionis experte et increato Verbo, sed conniretur superne increato Verbo. Quapropter et Dominum et Christum Deus fecit, id quod ex Maria conceptum et Deitati unitum est.

That is:—In order, therefore, that the holy dispensation in the *flesh* might not be left by the impassible and increate Word, but be united with the increate Word on high, God for this reason made this Jesus, whom ye crucified, both Lord and Christ, which was conceived by Mary and united with the Deity.

AMBROSIUS, libro 3, cap. 12, de Spiritu Sancto (tom. 2, p. 157, [fol. 765, ed. Colon,]): Angeli adorant non solum Divinitatem Christi, sed et *scabellum pedum* ejus. (Et postea): Illam terram propheta dicit adorandam, quam Dominus Jesus in carnis assumptione suscepit. Itaque per scabellum terra intelligitur, per *terram* autem *caro* Christi, quam hodie quoque in mysteriis adoramus, et quam apostoli in Domino Jesu, ut supra diximus, adorarunt.

That is:—The angels adore not only the divinity of Christ, but also his footstool. (And afterwards): That earth, says the Prophet, must be adored, which the Lord Jesus took unto himself in assuming flesh. For by footstool the earth is understood, but by the *earth* the *flesh* of Christ, which we still at the present day adore in the mysteries, and which the Apostles adored in the Lord Jesus, as we stated above.

AUGUSTINUS de verbis Domini, sermone 58 (tom. 10, p. 217,): Si Christus non est natura Deus, sed creatura, nec colendus est nec ut Deus adorandus. Sed illi ad hæc replicabunt ac dicent: Quid igitur est, quod *carnem* ejus, quam creaturam esse non negas, simul cum Divinitate adoras, et ei non minus quam Deitati deservis?

Idem in Psal. 99, 5 (tom. 8, p. 1103,): Adorate scabellum pedum ejus. Scabellum est terra, et Christus suscepit terram de terra, quia caro de terra est et de carne Mariæ carnem accepit. Et quia in ipsa carne hic ambulavit, et ipsam carnem manducandam nobis ad salutem dedit, nemo autem *carnem* illam manducat, nisi prius *adoraverit*. Inventum ergo est, quomodo adoretur tale scabellum pedum Domini, ut non solum non peccemus adorando, sed peccemus non adorando.

That is:—If by nature Christ is not God, but a creature, he must neither be worshipped nor adored as God, but in opposition to this,

these will reply and say: Why is it then, that you adore, at the same time with his divinity, his *flesh* also, which you deny not to be a creature, and serve it no less than the Deity?

The footstool is the earth, and Christ took earth from the earth, because the flesh is from the earth, and from the flesh of Mary he took flesh. And because he walked here in this flesh, he gave us that flesh to eat, and for our salvation. But no one eats that *flesh*, unless he has first adored it. A way has therefore been found, in which that footstool of the Lord may be adored, so that we not only do not sin by adoring it, but we sin by not adoring it.

CHRYSOSTOMUS ad Ebr. 2 (p. 125.): Magnum, admirabile et stupore plenum est, carnem nostram sursum sedere et adorari ab angelis et archangelis. Hoc sæpe mente versans ecstasin patior, cet. Idem 1 Cor. 10 (p. 174, [t. 6, fol. 740, et t. 5, fol. 261, ed. Francof.]): Hoc corpus Christi in præsepi jacens magi venerati sunt, cet., et a longe venientes cum timore et tremore multo adoraverunt. Idem apud Leonem epist. 65. Cognoscamus, quæ natura sit, cui Pater dixit: Esto meæ particeps sedis. Illa natura est, cui dictum est: Terra es et in terram ibis.

That is:—Wonderfully great and amazing is it, that our flesh is seated above, and adored by angels and by archangels. While often revolving this in my mind, I feel a transport, &c., 1 Cor. 10. This body of Christ lying in a manger the wise men venerated, &c., and coming from afar, they adored it with great fear and trembling. And again: Let us well understand what nature it is to which the Father says, Be thou a partaker of my seat. It is that nature to which it was said, Dust thou art, and to dust thou shalt return.

THEOPHYLACTUS ex Chrysostomo in caput Matt. 28 (p. 311, [ed. Lutet. 8, 1631, fol. 184 et 605.]): Quia *humana natura* prius condemnata, nunc vero juncta Deo Verbo personaliter sedet in cælo et ab angelis adoratur, merito dicit: Data est mihi omnis potestas in cælo et in terra. Etenim *humana natura* prius serviebat, nunc in Christo omnibus imperat.

Idem in 3 cap. Joh.: Pater omnia dedit in manum Filii juxta *humanitatem*.

That is:—Since *human nature*, which was previously condemned, but is now personally united with God the WORD, sits in heaven, and is adored by the angels, it justly says: Unto me is given all power in heaven and in earth. For the human nature, which previously served, rules now in Christ over all things.

The Father hath given all things into the hand of the Son *according to his humanity*.

CYRILLUS de Incarnatione, cap. 11 (t. 4, p. 241, [t. 5, fol. 695,]) : Verbum in id, quod non erat, se immisit, ut et *hominis natura* id, quod non erat, fieret, divinæ majestatis dignitatibus per adunctionem fulgens, quæ sublevata magis est ultra naturam, quam dejecit infra naturam invertibilem Deum.

Ephesinum concilium, (Cyril. tom. 4, p. 140, [Apologet. adv. Orient. t. 6, fol. 196,]) canone 11 : Si quis non confitetur *carne*s Domini esse vivificam, propterea quod propria facta est Verbi, quod omnia vivifcat, anathema sit.

Et Cyrillus (ibidem p. 140, [t. 4, fol. 85,]) in explicatione illius anathematisini dicit : Nestorium noluisse vivificationem tribuere *carni* Christi, sed sententias Joh. 6, exposuisse de sola Divinitate.

That is :—The WORD introduced itself into that which it was not, so that the *nature of man* might become that which it was not, shining through the union with the glories of divine Majesty, which is elevated above nature, rather than that it brought down the unchangeable God below this nature.

If any one should not confess that the *flesh* of the Lord is vivifying, inasmuch as it was appropriated to the WORD, which vivifies all things, let him be *anathema*.

Cyrillus, in his explanation of this anathematization, says that Nestorius would not attribute to the *flesh* of Christ this vivifying, but explained the declarations in John, ch. 6, as having reference to the divinity alone.

THEODORETUS dialogo 2 : *Illud corpus* et sessione ad dexteram Dei dignum habitum est et ab omni creatura adoratur, quia corpus appellatur naturæ domini.

Idem Psal. 8 : Hujusmodi honorem a Deo, universitatis scilicet imperium, *humana* in Christo natura accepit.

That is :—*This body* was both counted worthy of sitting at the right hand of God, and of being adored by all creatures, because it is called the *body* of the nature of the Lord.

The *human nature* in Christ has received such honor from God, namely, universal dominion.

LEO (fol. 94, [ep. 25, fol. 246,]) epistola 11 : Assumpti, non assumptionis provectio est, quod Deus illum exaltavit, et donavit illi nomen, quod est super omne nomen, ut in nomine Jesu omne genu flectatur, et omnis lingua confiteatur, quod Dominus sit Jesus Christus in gloria Dei Patris.

That is :—It was an exaltation of that which was assumed, (humanity,) and not of that which did assume (divinity) when God exalted him, and gave him a name which is above every name ; so

that at the name of Jesus every knee shall bow, and every tongue shall confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father.

DAMASCENUS, lib. 3, cap. 18, p. 251: *Divina Christi voluntas erat æterna et omnipotens, cet., humana vero ejus voluntas a tempore cæpit et naturales ac innoxias affectiones sustinuit, et naturaliter quidem non erat omnipotens, ut autem vere et secundum naturam Dei Verbi voluntas est facta, et omnipotens est, (hoc est, sicut commentator explicat: divina voluntas suapte natura habet potentiam omnia efficiendi, quæ velit, humana vero Christi voluntas non sua natura habet omniefficacem virtutem, sed ut Deo Verbo unita.)*

Idem cap. 19: *Caro operanti Deitati Verbi communicat, ideo quod divinæ operationes per organum corporis perficiebantur. Ita sancta ejus mens etiam naturales suas operationes operatur. Communicat autem et Deitati Verbi operanti ac gubernanti, ipsa etiam intelligens, cognoscens, et disponens totum universum, non ut nuda hominis mens, sed ut Deo secundum hypostasim cuncta et Dei mens constituta.*

Idem libro eodem, cap. 12: *Humana natura in Christo essentialiter non possidet seu obtinet futurorum cognitionem, sed ut domini anima, propter unionem ad ipsum Deum Verbum, locupletata est cum reliquis divinis prædictionibus etiam futurorum cognitione. (Et in fine capitis): Nos ergo dicimus, unum Christum eundemque simul Deum et hominem omnia scire, in ipso enim omnes thesauri sapientiæ absconditi sunt.*

That is:—The divine will of Christ is eternal, omnipotent, &c. But his *human* will began in time, and had the natural and innocent affections. And naturally indeed it was not omnipotent, but becoming truly and according to nature the will of God, the WORD, it is also omnipotent; that is, as the commentator explains these words: The divine will has power by its own nature to perform all things as it wills; but the human will of Christ has power to perform all things, not by its own nature, but because it is united with God the WORD.

The *flesh* has communion with the operating Divinity of the WORD, because the divine operations are performed through the body as the instrument, and also because he who performs divine and human operations, is one and the same. For it ought to be observed, that his holy mind performs its own natural operations, &c. And it shares with the operating and governing Divinity of the WORD, understanding, knowing, and arranging the whole universe,

not as the mere mind of man, but as a mind personally united with God, and constituted the mind of God.

The *human nature* in Christ does not essentially possess a knowledge of futurity, but the *soul* of the *Lord*, on account of its union with God the *WORD*, and the hypostatic oneness, is enriched with the other divine characteristics, and consequently also with a knowledge of futurity. We say, therefore, that *one* and the same *Christ*, *at the same time God and man*, knows all things; for in him all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge are hidden.

NICEPHORUS, lib. 18, cap. 36: Christus a discipulis in Galileæ monte conspicitur, et ibi a Patre summam potestatem cæli et terræ, *juxta humanam naturam* scilicet, traditam esse confirmat.

That is:—Christ was seen on the mount in Galilee by his disciples, and there he testifies that the highest power in heaven and on earth was given to him by the Father, namely, *according to his human nature*.

IV.

That the holy Scriptures and the Fathers understood that majesty which Christ received in time, not only concerning created gifts, *de finitis qualitatibus*, but also concerning that glory and majesty of the Divinity, which is God's own, to which his human nature in the person of the Son of God, was exalted, and thus received that power and operation of the divine nature, which belong to God.

Joh. 17, 5: Et nunc glorifica me, tu Pater, apud te ipsum ea gloria, quam habui apud te, priusquam mundus fieret.

Coloss. 2, 9: In ipso habitat omnis plenitudo Deitatis corporaliter.

That is:—John 17, 5: And now, O Father, glorify thou me with thine own self, with the glory which I had with thee before the world was.

Col. 2, 9: In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily.

HILARIUS de Trinitate, lib. 3 (p. 28.): Verbum caro factum orabat, ut *id, quod de tempore erat*, gloriam ejus claritatis, quæ sine tempore est, acciperet.

That is:—The *WORD* made flesh, entreated that *that which began in time*, might receive the glory of that brightness which is without time, (eternal.)

GREGORIUS NYSSENUS apud Gelasium et Theodoretum, dialogo 2, de dicto illo Petri, Act. 2, Dextera Dei exaltatus, cet. (tom. 2, p. 333, [al. 330,]): Ipsa dextera *unitum sibi hominem* in proprium suam evexit celsitudinem seu sublimitatem per unionem.

Idem de anima : *Deus Verbum* a communione illa, quæ sibi est ad *corpus* et *animam*, nunquam alteratur, neque particeps est imperfectionis illarum, sed *tradens eis suæ Divinitatis virtutem* manet idem, quod erat et ante unionem.

That is:—This right hand elevated the *man united with itself*, to its own peculiar loftiness or highness, through the union.

By that communion, which he has with the body and soul, God the WORD is never changed, neither is he a partaker of their imperfections, but while *giving them the power of his divinity*, remains the same (WORD) even as before this union.

BASILIIUS M. in Natio. Christi (p. 231.): Quomodo Deitas est in carne? sicut ignis in ferro, non transitive, sed communicative. Non enim excurrit ignis ad ferrum, sed manens in suo loco communicat seu impertit ferro ignito propriam suam facultatem, (vim seu potentiam,) nec communicatione illa minor sit, sed se ipso totum ferrum replet, quod (illa scilicet unione) particeps est ignis.

That is:—In what manner is the Divinity in the flesh? Even as fire in iron, not by way of transition, but by way of communication. For the fire does not hasten towards the iron, but, remaining in its place, communicates or imparts its own peculiar property, (virtue, or power,) to heated iron; nor does it become less by this communication, but with itself it fills the whole mass of iron, which (by that union namely) becomes a partaker of the fire.

EPIPHANIUS in Ancorato (fol. 504, [fol. 86, ed. Colon,]): (Idem Deus, idem homo) *corpus terrenum* una cum Deitate potens efficiens, *in unam potentiam univit*, in unitatem reduxit unus existens Dominus, unus Christus, non duo, &c.

That is:—The same God, the same man, uniting the *earthly body* with the divinity, *have one power*,—being one Lord, one Christ, not two Christs, nor two Gods, &c.

CYRILLUS in Johannem, lib. 4, cap. 23: Non imperite omnino vivificam carnem esse negatis. Nam si sola intelligatur, nihil prorsus vivificare potest, quippe quæ vivificante indigeat. Quum vero incarnationis mysterium laudabili cura scrutati fueritis, et vitam habitantem in carne cognoveritis, quamvis *nihil penitus caro per se ipsum possit, vivificam tamen factam esse credetis*. Nam quoniam cum vivificante Verbo conjuncta est, tota effecta est vivifica. Non enim ad corruptibilem suam naturam junctum Dei Verbum detraxit, sed ipsa ad melioris virtutem elevata est. Quamvis ergo natura carnis, ut caro est, vivificare nequeat, facit tamen hoc, quia *totam verbi operationem suscepit*. Non enim Pauli aut Petri aut caterorum, sed ipsius vitæ corpus, in quo Dei-

tatis plenitudo corporaliter habitat, facere hoc potest. Quas ob res caro ceterorum omnium nihil potest, *Christi* autem *caro*, quia in ipsa unigenitus Dei Filius habitat, sola vivificare potest.

That is:—It is by no means unwise in you to deny the flesh to be vivifying (or quickening). For, if it alone be understood, it cannot vivify any thing at all; yea, it needs that which vivifies it. But when you shall have examined the mystery of the Incarnation, with commendable diligence, and perceived life dwelling in the flesh, although the *flesh can do nothing at all of itself, you will, nevertheless, believe the flesh to have been made vivifying*. For, since it is united with the vivifying WORD, it has itself wholly become vivifying. For the flesh did not draw down to its corruptible nature the WORD of God, with which it is united, but was itself elevated to the power of the WORD which was greater. Although, therefore, the nature of the flesh, as it is flesh, is unable to vivify, (or to make alive,) yet it can do this, because it *has received the whole operation of the WORD*. For neither the body of Paul, nor of Peter, nor of any other, but the body of life itself, in which dwells all the fulness of the Godhead bodily, can do this. Hence the flesh of all others avails nothing. But the *flesh of Christ*, because the only-begotten Son of God dwells in it, alone can vivify or make alive.

AUGUSTINUS contra Felicianum Arianum, cap. 11: injuria sui corporis affectam non fateor Deitatem, sicut majestate Deitatis glorificatam novimus carnem.

That is:—I do not confess that the Divinity was affected by the ignominy of his body, as we know that the flesh was glorified by the majesty of the Divinity.

THEODORETUS cap. de Antichristo (tom. 2, p. 411.): Verbum homo factum non particularem gratiam contulit assumptæ naturæ, sed totam plenitudinem Deitatis complacuit in ipsa habitare.

Idem in Psalmum 21, tom. 1, p. 110: Si natura assumpta cum Divinitate assumente est copulata, etiam ejusdem gloriæ et honoris particeps et consors facta est.

Idem Ebr.: Ipsa *humanitas* post resurrectionem divinam gloriam est consecuta.

That is:—The WORD made man, did not confer a particular grace only upon the assumed nature, but it pleased God that the whole fulness of the Godhead should dwell in this nature.

If the assumed nature was united with the Divinity which assumed it, it was also made a partaker and sharer of the glory and honor of the Divinity.

After the resurrection the *humanity* itself obtained divine glory.

DAMASCENUS, lib. 3, cap. 7 et 15: Divina natura proprias suas excellentias seu glorificationes *carni* communicat seu impertit, ipsa vero in se passionum carnis manet expers.

That is:—The divine nature communicates or imparts its own peculiar excellency or glory to *the flesh*, but in itself it remains free from the sufferings of the flesh.

V.

That Christ, as God, possesses this divine majesty in one manner, namely, essentially, and as his own essential attribute, in, and of himself; but as man he possesses it in another manner, namely, not essentially, in, and of himself, but in consequence of, and according to the manner of the personal union.

Joh. 14, 6: Ego sum vita.

Joh. 5, 26, 27: Dedit ei vitam habere in se ipso, *quia filius hominis est*.

That is:—John 14, 6: I am the life.

John 5, 26, 27: The Father hath given to the Son to have life in himself, *because he is the Son of man*.

CYRILLUS, lib. 12, Thesauri cap. 15 (tom. 2, p. 167, [tom. 5, ed. Paris, 1638,]): *Conditio et proprietas alia creaturæ, alia creatori inest, sed natura nostra a Filio Dei assumpta mensuram suam excessit et in conditionem assumptis eam per gratiam translata est.*

Idem in Johannem, lib. 2, cap. 144 (tom. 1, p. 134, [tom. 4, ed. Paris, 1638,]): Christus causam subiecit, quare vitam et potestatem judicii sibi a Patre data dixerit, dicens: *quia filius hominis est*, ut intelligamus omnia sibi data esse ut *homini*. Unigenitus vero Filius non vitæ particeps, sed vita naturaliter est.

Idem lib. 3, cap. 37 (tom. 1, p. 181,): Vivificat *corpus Christi*, quia ipsius vitæ corpus est, virtutem Verbi incarnati retinens, et plenum potestate illius, quo universa sunt et vivunt.

Idem lib. 4, cap. 14 (p. 201,): Quoniam Salvatoris *caro* conjuncta est Verbo Dei, quod naturaliter vita est, effecta est vivifica.

Et cap. 18 (p. 204,): *Corpus meum* vita replevi, mortalem carnem assumpsit, sed quia naturaliter vita existens habito in ipsa, *totam ad vitam meam reformavi*.

Cap. 24 (p. 210,): *Natura carnis* ipsa per se vivificare non potest, nec sola esse in Christo intelligitur, sed habet Filium Dei sibi conjunctum, qui substantialiter vita est. Quando igitur vivificam Christus carnem suam appellat, non ita illi, ut sibi sive proprio Spiritui, vim vivificandi attribuit. Nam per se ipsum Spiritus vivificat ad ejus virtutem caro per conjunctionem conscendit. Quomodo

autem id fiat, nec mente intelligere nec lingua dicere possumus, sed silentio ac firma fide id suscipimus.

Idem lib. 10, cap. 13 (p. 501,): Caro vitæ, facta unigeniti caro, *ad virtutem vitæ reducta est.*

Idem lib. 11, cap. 21 (p. 552,): Ipsa *caro Christi* non a se sancta fuit, sed conjunctione Verbi ad Verbi virtutem quodammodo reformatâ, salutis atque sanctificationis causa est participantibus; non ergo carni, ut caro est, operationis divinæ virtutem, sed naturæ Verbi attribuiamus.

Lib. 6, Dialog. (tom. 5, op. ed. cit.): Glorificatur a Patre, non quia Deus, sed quoniam erat *homo*, quasi propriæ naturæ fructum non habens potentiam operandi efficaciter divine, accepit quodammodo illam per unionem et ineffabilem concursum, qui intelligitur Dei esse Verbi cum humanitate.

Idem de recta Fide ad Theodosium (p. 278,): Immisit assumpto corpori suam vitam ipsa per unionem dispensatione.

Ibidem (p. 279,): Vivificat Verbum propter ineffabilem nativitatem ex vivente Patre. Attamen est videre, ubi tribuatur etiam *propriæ carni divinæ efficacia gloriæ*. (Item): Otiosam confitebimur terrenam carnem ad hoc, ut possit vivificare, quatenus pertinet ad propriam ejus naturam.

That is:—There is one condition or property of the creature, and another of the Creator; *but our nature*, assumed by the Son of God, exceeds its own measure, and through grace, it is transferred into the condition of that nature which assumed it.

Christ assigns a reason why he said, that life and the power to exercise judgment are given him by the Father, when he thus speaks, *Because he is the Son of man*; in order that we may understand, that all is given to him *as man*. For the only-begotten Son is not a partaker of life, but he is life itself.

The body of Christ vivifies, because it is the body of life, retaining the virtue of the *incarnate Word*, and filled with the power of him, by whom all things are, and by whom they exist.

Since the *flesh* of the Savior is united with the *Word* of God, which *Word* is naturally life, it was made vivifying.

My body I have filled with life, I have assumed mortal flesh; but since I am naturally the life, I dwell in it, (the body,) having conformed it wholly to my life.

The *nature of the flesh* of itself cannot vivify, nor is that alone understood to be in Christ, but it finds connected with itself the Son of God, who is life substantially. When, therefore, Christ calls his flesh vivifying, he does not thus attribute unto it, as unto himself,

or unto his own Spirit, the power to make alive. For of himself the Spirit vivifies, to the power of whom, through the union, the flesh has arisen. But in what manner this comes to pass, we cannot understand with our minds, nor express with our tongues, but in silence and with firm faith we receive it.

The flesh of life, being made the flesh of the Only-begotten, was brought to the power of life.

This *flesh of Christ* was not holy in itself, but conformed to the power of the WORD by its union with the WORD, it is the cause of salvation and sanctification to the participants. Therefore, we do not attribute unto the flesh, as flesh, but to the nature of the WORD, the power of the divine operation.

He is glorified by the Father, not as God, *but as man*, since although not having as the fruit of his own nature the power of operating with divine efficacy, he received it in a certain manner, through the union and the ineffable conjunction of the WORD of God with the humanity.

He has introduced into his assumed body his own life, through the union of both natures.

The WORD vivifies on account of the ineffable birth from the living Father. Yet we should observe that the *efficacy of divine glory* is attributed to his own flesh also. Again: We will confess, that earthly flesh is incapable of vivifying so far as pertains to its own nature.

EPIPHANIUS contra Ariomanitas, p. 337 (Hæres 69, fol. 789, ed. Colon.): Humanitas enim illius non seorsim per se subsistit, non enim separata Deitate et seorsim existente natura humana dicebat, velut alius et alius, sed cuncta humanitate cum Deitate, una existente sanctificatione, et jam in ipsa, quæ perfectissima sunt, sciente, nimirum in Deo et in unam Deitatem coaptata.

That is:—The humanity of Christ does not exist separately of itself, but is united with the divinity, and now in that divinity knows those things which are most perfect, as being united with God.

AUGUSTINUS de verbis Domini, sermone 58 (tom. 10, p. 217 et 218.): Ego vero *dominicam carnem*, imo perfectam in Christo humanitatem ideo adoro, quod a Divinitate suscepta et Deitati unita est, et non alium et alium, sed unum eundemque Deum et hominem Filium Dei esse confiteor. Denique si hominem separaveris a Deo, illi nunquam credo nec servio.

Item: Humanitatem *non nudam* vel *solam*, sed Divinitati unitam, scilicet unum Dei Filium, Deum verum et hominem verum, si quis adorare contemserit, æternaliter morietur.

Augustinus de Civitate, lib. 10, cap. 24: Non ergo caro Christi *per se ipsam* mundat credentes, sed per Verbum, a quo suscepta est.

That is:—I adore the Lord's flesh, yes, the perfect humanity in Christ, because it is received by the Divinity and united with the Deity, and I do not confess that the one is God and the other man, but that the Son of God is at the same time God and man. But if you separate the man from God, I will neither believe him nor serve him.

Again: If any one shall disdain to adore the humanity, *not separate or alone*, but united with the divinity, namely, the one Son of God, true God and true man, he will suffer eternal death.

Therefore, the flesh of Christ purifies the believing, not *through itself*, but through the WORD, by whom it was received.

Ephesinum Concilium, canone 11 (ap. Cyrillum, tom. 6, fol. 196.): Si quis non confitetur carnem Domini esse vivificam propter ea, quod propria facta est Verbi, quod omnia vivificat, anathema sit.

That is:—If any one should not confess that the flesh of the Lord has power to give life, inasmuch as it was *made the property of the WORD* that animates all things, let him be accursed.

THEOPHYLACTUS in Joh. cap. 3 (fol. 605 et 184, ed. cit.): Omnia dedit in manum Filii *juxta humanitatem*; si autem et secundum Divinitatem intelligatur, dedit Pater omnia Filio ratione naturæ, non gratiæ.

Idem Matt. 28: Si de Divinitate, Deo Verbo, intelligas, (*data est mihi omnis potestas*,) sensus erit, et nolentes et volentes nunc me Deum agnoscunt, qui prius mihi serviebant involuntariæ obedientiæ modo. Si autem de *humana* natura dicitur, sic intellige: *Ego prius condemnata natura*, existens autem *Deus*, *secundum unionem ad Filium Dei*, absque naturarum confusione accepi potestatem omnem.

That is:—He gave all into the hands of the Son *according to his humanity*; but if this should be understood according to the divinity also, the Father gave all unto the Son, *by reason of his nature*, not by reason of *grace*.

If you understand these words,—*All power is given unto me*,—as relating to God, the WORD, the sense is: The willing and the unwilling now acknowledge me as God, who formerly served me after the manner of an unwilling obedience. But if these words are understood as relating to the *human nature*, the sense is: I, who was formerly a *condemned nature*, being however God according to the union with the Son of God, have received all power, without any confusion of the natures.

DAMASCENUS, lib. 3, cap. 17: Non secundum propriam operationem, sed propter unitum sibi Verbum divina operabatur (caro

Domini), Verbo per eam propriam suam operationem manifestante. Nam et ferrum ignitum urit non naturali ratione possidens ustricem operationem, sed obtinens eam ex unione ignis et ferri. Ipsa igitur caro Domini mortalis erat propter se ipsam, et vivifica propter hypostaticam ad Verbum unionem.

Idem cap. 18: Divina Christi voluntas erat æterna et omnipotens, humana vero ejus voluntas a tempore cœpit, et naturales ac innoxias affectiones sustinuit. Et naturaliter quidem non erat omnipotens, ut autem vere et secundum naturam Dei Verbi voluntas est facta, et omnipotens est. (Hoc est, sicut commentator explicat: divina voluntas suapte natura habet potentiam omnia efficiendi, quæ velit, humana vero Christi voluntas non sua natura habet omniefficacem virtutem, sed ut Deo Verbo unita.)

Idem libro eodem, cap. 21: Humana natura in Christo essentialiter non possidet seu obtinet futurorum cognitionem, sed ut Domini anima, propter unionem ad ipsum Deum Verbum, locupletata est cum reliquis divinis prædictionibus etiam futurorum cognitione. (Et in fine capitis): Nos ergo dicimus unum Christum, eundemque simul Deum et hominem, omnia scire. In ipso enim omnes thesauri sapientiæ et scientiæ absconditi sunt.

Idem lib. 2, cap. 22: Domini anima etsi secundum se erat naturæ futura ignorantis, attamen secundum hypostasin unita Deo Verbo omnium cognitionem habebat, non ex gratia seu participative, sed propter hypostaticam unionem. (Et paulo post): Et quia in Domino nostro Jesu Christo naturæ differunt, etiam naturales scientiæ et voluntates Divinitatis et humanitatis, cet.

That is:—Not according to its own operation, but on account of the WORD united to it, the flesh of the Lord performs divine operations, the WORD manifesting his own operation through the flesh. For the heated iron burns, but does not possess by nature the power to burn, but has acquired it from its union with the fire. The flesh of the Lord is, therefore, mortal in itself, but it possesses power to give life on account of the personal union with the WORD.

The divine will of Christ is eternal, omnipotent, &c.; but his human will began in time, and had the natural and innocent affections. And naturally, indeed, it was not omnipotent, but becoming truly and according to its nature the will of God the WORD, it is also omnipotent; that is, as the commentator explains these words: The divine will has power by its own nature to perform all things as it wills; but the human will of Christ has power to perform all things, not by its own nature, but because it is united with God the WORD.

The *human nature in Christ* does not essentially possess a knowledge of futurity, but *the soul of the Lord*, on account of its union with God the WORD, and the hypostatic oneness, is enriched with the other divine characteristics, and consequently also with a knowledge of futurity. We say, therefore, that one and the same Christ, at the same time *God and man, knows all things*. For in him are hidden all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

The *soul of the Lord*, although in itself it had no knowledge of the future, nevertheless, being personally united with God the WORD, has universal knowledge, not from grace or participation, but on account of the hypostatical union. And since the natures of our Lord Jesus Christ differ, there is also a difference between the will of the divinity and of the humanity, &c.

VI.

That now the Divinity efficaciously exhibits its majesty, power, and operation, (which remain the property of the divine nature,) and manifests them in, with, and through the humanity personally united with itself, which thus possesses majesty from the circumstance that the whole fulness of the divinity dwells personally in the assumed flesh and blood of Christ.

Rom. 3, 25: *Proposuit Christum propitiatorium per fidem in sanguine ejus.*

Rom. 5, 9: *Justificamur in sanguine ejus.*

Col. 1, 20: *In ipso pacificantur omnia per sanguinem crucis ejus, cet.*

That is:—Rom. 3, 25: God hath set forth Christ to be a propitiation, through faith in his *blood*.

Rom. 5, 9: Being now justified by his blood.

Col. 1, 20: Having made peace through the blood of his cross, by him to reconcile all things unto himself.

ATHANASIUS, oratione 4, contra Arianos (Epist. ad Adelph. c. Arian, t. l. f. 161, ed. Colon.): *Quomodo corpus domini non esset adorabile? Quum Verbum manum suam corporalem extendens sanarit febricitantem, vocem humanam edens suscitaverit Lazarum, manibus suis in cruce protensis principem æris prostraverit.*

Idem Dialogo 5, de Trinitate (tom. 2, op. fol. 257.): *Deus Λογος, unitus homini, edit miracula et operatur non seorsim aut separatim a natura humana assumpta, sed pro sua bonitate placuit ipsi per assumptam humanitatem, in ea et cum ea propriam divinam suam potentiam operando exercere. (Et paulo post): Et humanitatem illam suam ultra et supra propriam ipsius naturam pro suo beneplacito*

perfectam reddidit, non tamen prohibet, quo minus sit animal rationale seu vera humana natura.

That is:—In what manner is the *body* of the *Lord* not to be adored? Since the *WORD*, extending his bodily hand, healed the sick, and, uttering a human voice, called Lazarus from the dead; and with his hands stretched out upon the cross, prostrated the prince of the air.

God the *WORD* united with man, works and performs miracles, not apart or separate from the assumed human nature, but according to his goodness it pleased him, to exercise his own divine power in his operation, through his assumed humanity, and in and with it. And according to his good pleasure, he rendered his humanity perfect over and above its own nature, yet he does not prevent it from being a rational living being, or a true human nature.

CYRILLUS de recta Fide ad Theodosium (tom. 5, op.): Anima, unionem sortita ad Verbum descendit in infernum, divina autem virtute et efficacia utens, dixit compeditis: Egredimini.

Idem lib. 1, ad Reginas: Christus ut Deus vivificat per propriam carnem.

That is:—The soul which obtained a union with the *WORD*, descended into hell; *but using divine virtue and efficacy*, it said unto the prisoners: Go forth.

Christ as God, vivifies through his own flesh.

VII.

And that this communication of divine majesty takes place without any confusion, abolishing or suppression of the human nature, even in glory.

Matt. 16, 27: Filius hominis venturus est in gloria Patris sui.

Et Act. 1, 11: Sic veniet, quemadmodum vidistis euntem in cœlum.

That is:—Matt. 16, 27: The Son of man shall come in the glory of his Father.

Acts 1, 11: He shall so come in like manner as ye have seen him go into heaven.

ANTHANASIUS Dialog. 5, de Trinitate (tom. 2, fol. 257, ed. Colon.): Humanitatem illam suam supra et ultra propriam ipsius naturam pro suo beneplacito perfectam reddidit, non tamen prohibet, quo minus sit animal rationale seu vera humana natura.

That is:—*This humanity*, according to his own good pleasure, he rendered perfect *over and above its own nature*, yet he does not prevent it from being a rational living being, or a true human nature.

THEOPHYLACTUS ex Chrysostomo in caput Matt. 28 (fol. 184.): Ego prius damnata natura, nunc Deus existens secundum unionem ad Filium Dei absque naturarum confusione, accepi potestatem omnium.

That is:—I, at first a condemned nature, have now received, *without any confusion of the natures*, the power over all things.

CYRILLUS, lib. 4, cap. 24 (t. 4, fol. 377 et 3, fol. 783.): Totum corpus suum vivifica Spiritus virtute plenum esse ostendit, *non quod naturam carnis amiserit et in Spiritum mutata sit*, sed quia cum Spiritu conjuncta totam vivificandi vim hausit.

Idem de Incarnatione, cap. 8: In carbone tamquam in imagine licet conspiciere adunitum quidem humanitati Deum Verbum, transformasse assumptam naturam in suam gloriam et operationem. Sicut ignis ligno affixus, ita adunitus est inæstimabiliter humanitati Deus, conferens ei etiam naturæ suæ operationem.

That is:—He has shown that his whole body is filled with the life-giving virtue of the Spirit, *not that he has laid aside the nature of his flesh, and that it was changed into Spirit*; but because, united with the Spirit, it has received the whole power to impart life.

In a burning coal, as an illustration, it may be perceived how God the Word is united with the humanity, *transforming the assumed nature into his own glory and operation*. As the fire cleaves to the wood, so God is immeasurably united with the humanity, conferring upon it even the operation of his own nature.

THEODORETUS, Dialog. 2 (t. 4, fol. 82 et 112.): Corpus dominicum surrexit quidem a mortuis incorruptibile, impassibile, immortale, divina glorificatum gloria, et a cœlestibus adoratur potestatibus, corpus tamen est et habet, quam prius habuit, circumscriptionem.

Idem Dialogo 3, probat hanc Apollinariî sententiam: Si mixtio ignis cum ferro, quæ ferrum ostendit ignem, ita ut etiam ea faciat, quæ sunt ignis, non mutat naturam ferri: neque igitur Dei cum corpore unio est mutatio corporis, licet corpori divinas operationes præbeat.

That is:—The body of the Lord arose from the dead indeed, incorruptible, impassible, immortal, *glorified with divine glory*, and is adored by celestial powers, *yet it is a body*, and is circumscribed as it was at first.

If a mixture of fire with iron, which shows the iron to be fire, so that it also effects those things which are done by fire, *does not change the nature of the iron*; so too the union of God, therefore, with the body, is not a mutation of the body, although it imparts divine operations to the body.

DAMASCENUS, lib. 3, cap. 17: Caro Domini locupletata est divinis

operationibus propter hypostaticam ejus ad Verbum unionem, non passa excidentiam eorum, quæ secundum naturam ipsi propria sunt.

Idem lib. 2, cap. 22: Domini anima etsi secundum se erat naturæ ignorantis, futura attamen secundum hypostasim unita Deo Verbo omnium cognitionem habuit, non ex gratia seu participative, sed propter hypostaticam unionem. (Et paulo post): In Domino nostro Jesu Christo, quia naturæ differunt, differunt etiam naturales scientiæ et voluntates Dominitatis et humanitatis.

That is:—The *flesh of the Lord* is enriched with divine operations, on account of its personal union with the WORD, *not suffering*, however, any diminution of those properties which are peculiar to it according to its own nature.

The *soul of the Lord*, although in itself it had no knowledge of the future, nevertheless, being personally united with God the WORD, it has *universal knowledge*, not from grace, or participation, but on account of the personal union; and since the natures are different in Christ, there is also a difference between the will of the divinity and of the humanity, &c.

VIII.

Again, that the human nature is a partaker of, and capable of receiving the divine majesty, which is the property of God, according to the nature and in consequence of the personal union.

Coloss. 2, 9, 3: In ipso inhabitat omnis plenitudo Deitatis corporaliter. In ipso absconditi sunt omnes thesauri sapientiæ et cognitionis.

That is:—In him dwelleth all the fulness of the Godhead bodily; in whom are hid all the treasures of wisdom and knowledge.

JUSTINUS in Expositione Fidei, p. 182 (fol. 389, ed. Colon, 1686.): Nec ita ipsum in Patre, ut in reliquis, esse dicimus, non eo quidem, quod substantia in aliis existens contrahatur, sed propter eorum, qui illam capiunt, modulum, per imbecillitatem suam divinam præsentiam non admittentium. (Item): Nam corpus pollutum radios Divinitatis non capit. (Et paulo post): Eodem modo mihi considera, justitiæ solem, universis quidem ex æquo substantia, ut qui Deus sit, præsentem esse, nos vero omnes utpote infirmos et peccatorum sordibus lipientes, oculis nostris, propter languorem, lucis præsentiam sustinere non posse, proprium vero illius templum oculum purissimum et splendoris universæ lucis capacem esse, utpote a Spiritu Sancto formatum et a peccato ex parte segregatum.

That is:—Nor do we say that he is in the Father, as in others, not indeed because his substance existing in others, contracts its dimension, but on account of the measure of those who receive it, not

admitting his divine presence, in consequence of their incapacity. For a polluted body does not comprehend the rays of the divinity. (And a little afterwards): In this manner consider, that the Son of righteousness, according to his substance as God, is equally present to all; but we all, since we are infirm and blinded with the darkness of sins, are unable to endure with our eyes the presence of his light, but that the peculiar temple of Christ, his assumed nature, because the fulness of the Godhead dwells therein, comprehends the splendor of the whole divine light.

ORIGENES de Principiis, lib. 2, cap. 6 (t. 1, op. fol. 698 et 749, ed. Basil,) : Anima Christi tota totum Λόγον recipit atque in ejus lucem splendoremque cedit.

Et lib. 4: Anima Christi cum Verbo Dei conjuncta, Filii Dei plene capax fuit.

That is:—The whole soul of Christ has received the whole WORD, and is taken up in his light and splendor.

The soul of Christ, united with the WORD of God, has full capacity for the Son of God.

AUGUSTINUS, epist. 57 : Deus licet omnibus creaturis totus sit præsens, ac præcipue in credentibus habitet, non tamen ex toto illum capiunt, sed pro suæ capacitatis diversitate, alii amplius, alii minus ipsum habent et capiunt. De capite vero nostro Christo apostolus ait : In ipso inhabitat tota plenitudo Deitatis corporaliter.

That is:—Although God is wholly present in all creatures,—and dwells especially in believers,—yet they do not entirely comprehend him. But according to the diversity of their capacities, some possess and comprehend him in a greater, and some in a less degree. But concerning Christ our Head, the Apostle says : In him dwelleth *all the fulness of the Godhead* bodily.

IX.

Although it is known and undeniable, that the Divinity with its divine majesty is not locally circumscribed by the flesh, as if it were contained in a vessel, even as Athanasius, Origen, Gregory of Nyssa, and others, have correctly written; (and indeed in the Book of Concord it is likewise expressly rejected as an error, if it should be taught that the humanity of Christ is locally expanded in all places, or, that the human nature in Christ is changed by the personal union into an infinite essence;) yet since the divine and human natures are personally and inseparably united in Christ, the holy Scriptures and the Fathers testify, that wherever Christ is present, there not his divided person, or the half or only a part of his person is present,

as, for instance, his divinity, separately and alone, without and apart from his assumed and personally united humanity, or separated from it, and apart from the personal union with the humanity, but that his whole person, namely, as God and man, according to the manner of the personal union with the humanity,—which is an inscrutable mystery,—is everywhere present in a way and manner known to God alone.

Ephes. 4, 10: *Ascendit super omnes cœlos, ut impleret omnia. Quod Œcumenius ita interpretatur: Etenim nuda quoque Divinitate olim omnia implebat. Et incarnatus, ut omnia eum carne impleret, descendit, et ascendit.*

That is:—He ascended up far above all heavens, that he might fill all things. This Œcumenius explains thus: For with his divinity alone he has long since filled all things. And now being made flesh, he descended and ascended, in order that he might fill all things with his flesh.

Et THEOPHYLACTUS ibidem (Comment. in Eph. fol. 535, ed. Lond. 1636.): *Ut omnia impleat dominatione operationeque, idque in carne, quandoquidem Divinitate jam antea cuncta completeret. Hæc autem adversus Paulum Samosatenum et Nestorium sunt.*

That is:—In order that he might fill all things with his dominion and operation, and this in the flesh, since long before he filled all things with his Divinity. But this is opposed to Paulus Samosatenus and Nestorius.

LEO, epistol. 10 (Ep. 24, cap. 5, fol. 245, et in Serm. fol. 121, ed. cit.): *Catholica ecclesia hac fide vivit ac proficit, ut in Christo Jesu, nec sine vera Divinitate humanitas, nec sine vera credatur humanitate Divinitas.*

Idem Sermone 3, de Passione: *Hoc catholica fides tradit, hoc exigit, ut in Redemptore nostro duas noverimus convenisse naturas, et manentibus proprietatibus suis tantam factam unitatem utriusque substantiæ, ut ab illo tempore, quo in beatæ virginis utero Verbum caro factum est, nec Deum illum sine hoc, quod est homo, nec hominem sine hoc liceat cogitare, quod est Deus.*

Ibidem: *Exprimit quidem sub distinctis operationibus veritatem suam utraque natura, sed neutra se ab alterius connexione disjungit, nihil ibi ab invicem vacat sed suscepit totum hominem Deus et ita se illi atque illum sibi conseruit, ut utraque alteri naturæ inesset et neutra in alteram a sua proprietate transiret.*

That is:—In this faith the Catholic church lives and makes progress, namely, that in Christ Jesus the humanity is not believed to exist without the true Divinity, nor the Divinity without the true humanity.

This the Catholic faith teaches, and this it requires, that in our Redeemer we should know that two natures have come together, and that while their attributes remain, such a union of each substance is effected, that from the time in which the WORD was made flesh in the womb of the blessed Virgin Mary, we dare not consider this God without the additional fact of his being man, nor this man without the fact of his being *God*.

Each nature indeed under distinct operations, sets forth its truth, but neither disjoins itself from connection with the other; neither nature is apart from the other, but God has received the whole man, and thus joined himself to that nature, and that nature to himself, so that each nature is in the other, and neither is transferred from its own property into the other.

X.

But since in this article, this doctrine is chiefly designed to point out unto us where we ought to seek the whole person of the Mediator, God and man, and where we may apprehend it, the Book of Concord, like the writings of all the orthodox Fathers, directs us, not to wood or stone, or any other thing, but to that unto which Christ points and directs us in and with his Word.

CYRILLUS, lib. 12, in Johannem cap. 32 (t. 3, fol. 1063, ed. cit.): In quatuor partes vestimenta Christi divisa sunt, et tunica sola indivisa mansit, quod mysticæ cujusdam rei signum esse dixerim. Nam quatuor orbis partes ad salutem reductæ, indumentum Verbi, id est, carnem ejus impartibiliter inter se partitæ sunt. In singulis enim partibiliter transiens Unigenitus, et animam et corpus eorum per carnem suam sanctificans, impartibiliter atque integre in omnibus est, quum unus ubique sit nullo modo divisus.

That is:—The garments of Christ were divided into four parts, and his coat alone remained undivided; this, I may say, is a sign of something mystic. For the four quarters of the world, being brought to the knowledge of salvation, have shared among themselves the vesture of the WORD, that is, his flesh, indivisibly. For the Only-begotten divisibly passing into each, and sanctifying through his flesh their soul and body, is in all wholly and indivisibly, since everywhere he is one and in no manner divided.

THEOPHYLACTUS in caput 19, Johannis (fol. 825, ed. cit.): Igitur sanctum Christi corpus *indivisibile est*, et dividitur et communicatur in quatuor partes orbis; distributus enim singulis, et uniuscujusque animam sanctificans cum corpore *per carnem suam*, Unigenitus et

integer et indivisus in omnibus est, *existens ubique*, nunquam enim divisus est, sicut et Paulus clamat.

That is:—Therefore the holy body of Christ, although indivisible, is divided and communicated unto the four quarters of the world; for, distributed to each one, and sanctifying with his body, *through his flesh*, the soul of each, the Only-begotten is entire and undivided in all, *existing everywhere*; for he is never divided, as Paul also asserts.

CHRYSOSTOMUS (t. 4, fol. 1773, ed. Basil, et t. 6, fol. 846, ed. Francof.) Homil. 17, ad Ebr. p. 16 (et Ambrosius cap. 10, ad Hebræos.): Numquid, quia in multis locis offertur, ideomulti Christi sunt? Nequaquam; sed unus ubique est Christus, et hic plenus existens et illic plenus, unum corpus. Quemadmodum enim, qui in multis locis offertur, unum corpus est et non multa corpora, ita etiam et unum sacrificium. Pontifex autem noster ille est, qui hostiam mundantem nos obtulit, ipsam offerimus et nunc, quæ tunc oblata quidem consumi non potest. Hoc in memoriam ejus fit, quod tunc factum est. Hoc enim facite, inquit, in mei recordationem. Non igitur aliud sacrificium quemadmodum summus sacerdos, sed idem semper facimus. Magis autem recordationem sacrificii operamur.*

That is:—Do you suppose, because he is offered up in many places, that therefore there are many Christs? By no means; but there is one Christ everywhere, existing here entire and there entire, one body. For as he who is offered up in many places, is one body and not many bodies, so there is also but one sacrifice. But he is our High Priest, who made a cleansing sacrifice for us; we offer up that now, which being then offered up, was not consumed. This is done in remembrance of that which was then done. For, this do, he says, in remembrance of me. Therefore, we do not make another sacrifice, like the high priest, but always the same. Or rather, we renew the memory of the sacrifice made on the cross.

CONCLUSION.

These testimonies of the ancient teachers of the church, Christian reader, have not been here appended under the impression that our Christian faith is founded upon the authority of men. For the true and saving faith should not be founded upon the authority of any ancient or modern teachers of the church, but solely and exclusively upon the Word of God, which is comprehended in the writings of

* Contra pontificium sacrificium propitiatorium missæ; that is, against the Popish propitiatory sacrifice of the mass.

the holy Prophets and Apostles, as credible witnesses of the heavenly truth. But since, by the special and prompt artifices of Satan, certain fanatical spirits would readily lead the people again from the holy Scriptures,—which, God be praised, can now be profitably read by a common layman,—into the writings of the Fathers and ancient teachers of the church, as into the wide sea ; so that he who has not read these writings, is consequently unable to know with certainty whether they and their writings exhibit that sense in which these new teachers employ their terms, and is thus left in oppressive doubts ; it was, consequently, necessary for us to show by this *Catalogue*, and exhibit it as an evidence to all, that this new false doctrine is founded as little on the writings of the ancient pure teachers of the church, as on the holy Scriptures, but is directly in opposition to them. These testimonies they quote in a false sense, contrary to the intention of the Fathers, just as they wilfully and maliciously pervert the pure testimonies of the holy Scripture, and the direct, clear, and lucid words of the testament of Christ. For this reason, then, the Book of Concord refers each and every one to the holy Scriptures and to the simple Catechism. For he who embraces the simplicity of these with true and simple faith, best secures his soul and conscience, since they are founded on a firm, and an immovable rock, Matt. 7, 24, 25; ch. 16, 18; Gal. 1, 11, 12; Psalm 119.

THE END.

INDEX.

I. OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURE.

The only rule and standard of doctrine, the prophetic and apostolic Scriptures alone of the Old and New Testaments,	pages 551, 593	these books not rejected or prohibited,	page 595
Why reference should be had to other books besides the Bible,	551, 593	That in the Book of Concord no new confessions of faith are made,	593
Other writings which accord with		Why an account has been given in this book concerning controverted articles,	595, 596

II. OF GOD.

The three chief Symbols,	page 99	What is understood by the word <i>person</i> ,	109
The Augsburg Confession,	105	Of the Manicheans who have adopted two gods, the one good, the other evil,	109
Apology,	141	Of heretics who adopt but one person in the Godhead,	109
Smalcald Articles,	289	Of the Antitrinitarians,	589, 731
The Smaller Catechism,	415, 417	Of Creation,	417, 491
The Larger Catechism,	438, 487, 490		
What God is, and that he is one in essence and threefold in person,	109, 145, 366		

III. OF THE PERSON AND OFFICE OF CHRIST.

Augsburg Confession,	page 110	How it is to be understood that the blood of Christ cleanses us from our sins,	696
Apology,	156	That according to his human nature Christ obtained almighty power even in his mother's womb, and demonstrated it in the state of his humiliation,	689, 690, 702
Smalcald Articles,	366	That Christ knows all things,	700
The Smaller Catechism,	417	That the flesh of Christ is vivifying,	700
The Larger Catechism,	493	That Christ can, even according to his humanity, be present in all places wherever he will, and for this reason also in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper, with his body and blood,	680, 701
Epitome,	574	How consolatory it is unto us in crosses and afflictions, that Christ can be everywhere with us according to his humanity,	702
Declaration,	685	That it is by no means the meaning of this book, that the human nature in Christ is equalized with the divinity, either according to the essence or to the attribute,	687
Catalogue of Testimonies,	375	Of the error of Nestorius and Samosatenus, that the divine and human natures are united with each other, as two	
Neither the Father nor the Holy Ghost, but the Son of God alone became man,	366		
That Christ is true God and man in one person,	110, 156		
Of the New Arians,	589, 731		
Whence originated the controversy concerning the person of Christ,	685		
The pure doctrine concerning the person of Christ, embraced in certain articles,	575, 686		
Contrary and false doctrine concerning the person of Christ, embraced in certain articles, and condemned,	578, 703		
Of the real communication of the properties of both natures in Christ,	575 [687]		
That it is rightly said, and how it is to be understood, that God suffered and died for us,	692		

- boards are glued together, and that they have no communion at all with each other, 687
- Of the office and work of Christ the Lord, relative to our redemption, 689
- Of the descent of Christ into hell, 580, 704
- As long as the suffering and death of Christ place the wrath of God before our eyes and terrify mankind, so long is this not a declaration of the Gospel, but an exhibition of the law, 567, 651

IV. OF THE HOLY SPIRIT.

- The Smaller Catechism, page 418
- The Larger Catechism, 495
- The Holy Spirit, and his work and operation, 418, 495
- The fruits of the Holy Spirit, 569, 656
- Concerning the conversion of man, two efficient causes are found in the Scripture, through which he is converted, namely, the Holy Spirit and the Word of God, 559, 617, 618, 622
- That the Holy Spirit works faith through the hearing of the Gospel, 110, 176
- That faith and salvation are preserved in us, not by works, but by the Spirit of God, 622, 623
- False notion, that those who have once obtained the Holy Spirit and the remission of sins, and become believers, retain their faith, even if they afterwards fall into open sins, 383, 622

V. OF THE LAW AND THE GOSPEL.

- Apology, page 180
- Smalcald Articles, 376, 383
- The Smaller Catechism, 415, 417
- The Larger Catechism, 436, 438, 490
- Epitome, 565, 567
- Declaration, 649, 655
- That the word of God is divided into the doctrine of the law and the Gospel, 621
- That the doctrine of the law and of the Gospel should be continually urged in the church of God with diligence, 654, 655
- That the Christian church is known by the Gospel and the Sacraments, 216
- That the Holy Spirit works faith through the hearing of the Gospel, 110, 167
- As the preaching of repentance is universal, so is also the promise of the Gospel, 715
- That the distinction between the law and the Gospel is to be retained, 566, 619
- The doctrine of the law, 566, 657
- All that reproves sins, and proclaims the wrath of God, belongs to the law, 566, 651
- Of the use of the law, and why it was given, 567, 652, 653
- As long as the suffering and death of Christ terrify, so long is this, not a declaration of the Gospel, but an exhibition of the law, 567, 652
- Since unbelief is the fountain of all punishable sins, the law punishes it also, 652
- Of the third use of the divine law, 567, 655
- The law must be preached not only among the unbelieving and impenitent, but also among sincere believers, &c., 568, 657
- Of the Antinomians, the adversaries of the law, 652
- The difference between the works of the law and the fruits of the Spirit, 569, 658
- Why Christ explains the law, 567, 651
- To teach and to explain the law is an extraneous work of Christ, but to preach the Gospel is his own work, 567, 649
- The word *Gospel* is used in two different senses, 566, 649
- When by the word *Gospel*, the whole doctrine of Christ is understood, it is a declaration concerning repentance and remission of sins. But when the Law and the Gospel are compared, it is not a declaration of repentance, but of comfort concerning the grace of God through Christ, 566, 658
- Those who transform the Gospel into a doctrine of law, rob Christians of that true consolation, which they have in the Gospel against the terrors of the law, requiring the Papistical doctrine, 655
- That in the law, not only outward, but also inward, perfect obedience is required, 157
- Explanation of the Decalogue, 415, 438

VI. OF FREEWILL AND CONVERSION.

- Augsburg Confession, page 114
- Apology, 281
- Smalcald Articles, 376
- Epitome, 556
- Declaration, 609
- How the declaration of Luther is to be

- understood: The will of man in his conversion remains purely passive, that is, it does nothing at all, but merely permits what God works in him, 559, 629
- That in spiritual matters man is like a pillar of salt; like Lot's wife; or, like wood and stone; or, a dead image, 614
- Why the doctrine is wrong, that there are three efficient causes of the conversion of unregenerate man to God, 629
- Before the conversion of man, there are but two efficient causes found, through which he is converted, namely, the Holy Spirit, and the Word of God, 559, 618, 628
- The error of the Stoics, that man does all through constraint, and that all that happens, *must* so happen, 558, 625
- The error of the enthusiasts, that God converts men without the external preaching and hearing of his word, through his Spirit, 558, 610, 626
- The error of the Pelagians, that man is able by his own powers, without the grace of the Holy Spirit, to convert himself to God, 558, 625
- The error of the Papists and of the Schoolmen, that man is able, by his own natural powers, to begin a virtuous life, 626
- The doctrine, that in conversion the will of man is not idle, but does something, 626
- Rejection of the opinion of the Synergists, 626
- That the expressions of the Fathers, as Chrysostom: *Deus trahit, sed volentem*; and Basil: *Tantum velis, et Deus praevenit*,—are not analogous to the form of sound doctrine, 628

VII. OF SIN.

- | | | | |
|----------------------|----------|----------------------|----------|
| Augsburg Confession, | page 115 | Of the cause of sin, | 115, 281 |
| Apology, | 281 | What sin is, | 375 |
| Smalcald Articles, | 375 | Of actual sin, | 275 |
| Of the fall of Adam, | 375 | | |

OF ORIGINAL SIN.

- | | | | |
|----------------------|-----|--|---------------|
| Augsburg Confession, | 109 | The opinion of the Pelagians concerning original sin, | 554, 600 |
| Apology, | 145 | The opinion of the Manichæans concerning original sin, | 555, 598, 602 |
| Epitome, | 553 | How and why original sin is called by Luther, natural, personal, essential depravity, | 555, 603, 606 |
| Declaration, | 597 | In preaching concerning original sin, we should not employ on the pulpit the words <i>substantia</i> and <i>accidens</i> , but in the schools they may be used advantageously, | 556, 607 |
- How dreadful a thing this hereditary disease is, 598
- Whether original sin is the substance, nature, and essence of man, 553, 600
- How the opinion, that original sin is the substance of man, militates against all the articles of the Christian faith, 553, 602

VIII. OF THE JUSTIFICATION OF MAN BEFORE GOD, BY FAITH ALONE.

- | | | | |
|----------------------|----------------|---|-------------------------|
| Augsburg Confession, | pages 110, 115 | That we are justified through Christ, without any of our merits, by faith alone, | 110, 156, 389, 550, 639 |
| Apology, | 156, 166, 171 | A right and saving faith is not merely a knowledge of the histories concerning Christ, but a cordial reliance upon the grace of God through Christ, | 240 |
| Smalcald Articles, | 389 | That the Holy Spirit works faith through the hearing of the Gospel, | 110, 176 |
| Epitome, | 560 | The false opinion of the Anabaptists and others, who teach, that we receive, without the hearing of the Word of God, the Holy Spirit and faith, | 111 |
| Declaration, | 629 | That faith justifies us—not that our faith is a work so precious and pure; but solely because by faith, and by no other means, we receive the mercy of God offered, | 174, 210 |
- What the word to *justify* signifies in the Scripture, 561, 631
- What our righteousness is, 560, 629
- Of the essential righteousness of God, 639
- That Christ is our righteousness, not according to his divinity alone, nor yet according to his humanity alone, but the whole Christ, according to both natures, 560, 629, 640
- That the obedience, the sufferings, the death, and resurrection of Christ are our righteousness, 630, 631

How the word *sola*, alone, is founded in the Scripture, 171
 By the word *sola*, alone, we do not exclude the Gospel and the Sacraments, but only our own merit, 171
 In the article concerning the justification of man, Paul excludes, not only the works of the ceremonial law, but those also of the Decalogue, 174
 That for the preservation of the pure doctrine concerning the justification by faith, the *particulæ exclusivæ*, that is, the following words of St. Paul: By grace, without merit, without law, without works, not of works,—are to be firmly maintained, 561, 630, 636
 How the words *regeneration* and *vivification*, considered in the Apology, are to be understood concerning the justification of man, by which words elsewhere the renovation of man is understood, 561, 632
 That neither contrition nor love, neither

conversion nor sanctification, nor any good work, nor any merit, pertains to the article concerning justification, 562, 564, 565, 631
 If it be taught that the works of the law justify, or merit the forgiveness of sins, we can never be certain of the forgiveness of sins, 189, 190
 Refutation of the arguments of the adversaries, by which they wish to show that we are justified, not by faith, but by the works of love, 190
 That the works of love follow faith, 178 [179, 184
 That a justifying faith must not be imagined to consist in any wise with an evil intention to sin and to act contrary to conscience, 562, 633, 636
 The difference between faith and hope, [207
 Explanation of the Creed, 417, 470
 The comfort, peace, and joy in the Holy Spirit in the believers, 187

IX. OF GOOD WORKS.

Augsburg Confession, pages, 111, 115
 Apology, 180, 268
 Smalcald Articles, 389
 Epitome, 563
 Declaration, 641
 What good works are, 115
 That we should do good works, 642, 643
 How they must occur to be acceptable with God, 643, 645
 That the propositions and modes of expressions are not consistent with the Word of God: Good works are necessary to salvation: It is impossible to be saved without good works: No one has ever been saved without good works, 563, 564, 641, 642, 644, 645
 These propositions arose in the time of persecution, 646
 How these words, *necessity* and *necessarity*, must be understood, 564, 642
 How it must be understood, that the regenerated perform good works from a free, spontaneous spirit, not compelled or constrained, 564, 644

That faith and salvation are preserved in us, not by works, but by the Spirit of God, 565, 646, 647
 That this expression is offensive and pernicious to Christian discipline: Good works are pernicious to salvation, 565, 648
 That good works do not merit salvation, 189
 Concerning *merito congrui* and *condigni*, 160, 184, 207, 209, 211
 Concerning works of supererogation, 212 [233
 The false opinion of those who intimate, that those who once obtain the Holy Spirit and the remission of sins, and become faithful, even if they fall into open sins, retain faith, 647
 That we are sinners before God, 186
 Of perfection, in what it consists, 114, 132
 Of satisfaction or expiation for sins, 233 [248
 Of indulgences, 196, 232, 262, 263, 336 [357, 371, 380

OF HUMAN TRADITIONS AND ORDINANCES.

Apology, page 268
 Smalcald Articles, 390
 Of fasts and the diversity of meats, 126, 128

Of pilgrimages, rosaries, and brotherhoods, 115, 257, 353, 370

OF MONASTIC VOWS AND LIFE.

Augsburg Confession, page 129
 Apology, 339
 Smalcald Articles, 389

Of the relics of saints, 370
 Of spectres, 370
 Of purgatory, 333, 263, 330, 367, 369, 380

X. OF GOD'S FOREKNOWLEDGE AND ELECTION.

- Epitome, page 583
 Declaration, 710
 The difference between the foreknowledge and eternal election of God, [583, 584, 711, 712
 That the foreknowledge extends to the good and to the bad, 583, 711
 The cause of sin and of the destruction of the ungodly, is not the foreknowledge, but much rather the wicked, perverted will of the devil and men, 583, 711
 That the predestination or eternal election of God pertains only to the pious, and children of God, 583, 711
 This predestination of God is not to be sought out in God's secret counsel, but in the Word of God, in which it is revealed, 584, 712
- As the preaching of repentance is universal, so is also the promise of the Gospel, 715
 That Christ the Lord is the book of life, in which are written all that will be saved, 584, 713
That many be called, but few chosen, does not imply that God does not desire to save all men, but by this the malicious contempt of God's Word and the obduracy of men are punished, 584, 716
 That the doctrine is wrong, that not only the mercy of God and the merit of Christ are the cause, but that in us also there is a cause, of the election of God. 726

XI. OF REPENTANCE.

- Augsburg Confession, page 112
 Apology, 330
 Smalcald Articles, 377
 Smaller Catechism, 422
 Epitome, 565
 Declaration, 649
 What repentance is, 112, 230, 378
 That repentance consists of two parts—contrition and faith, 231
 That repentance continues with Christians till death, 383
- As the preaching of repentance is universal, so is also the promise of the Gospel, 715
 That those who fall into sin after baptism, obtain the remission of sins, whenever, and as often as they repent, 230
 Of the errors of the Papists concerning repentance, 234
 Of servile and filial fear, 236
 Of expiation, 251

OF CONFESSION AND ABSOLUTION.

- Augsburg Confession, page 112, 125
 Apology, 248
 Smalcald Articles, 386
 The Smaller Catechism, 422
 The Larger Catechism, 542
 Of confession before God, and before neighbors and church officers, 249 [250, 386
- That it is impossible and unnecessary to enumerate all sins in confession, 112, 125, 229
 That we are not bound to make confession at a particular time, 228, 414
 Of absolution and the power of the keys, [133, 228, 234, 257, 260, 261, 263, 383

OF EXCOMMUNICATION.

- Smalcald Articles, 387

XII. OF THE SACRAMENTS.

- Augsburg Confession, page 112
 Apology, 226, 261, 294
 Smalcald Articles, 381
 What the sacraments are, and how many, 264, 265
 That there are only two sacraments, not seven, as the Papists intimate, 264
 That the sacraments administered by ungodly ministers are efficacious, [222, 226
 Of the right use of the sacraments, [112, 266

XIII. OF BAPTISM.

- Augsburg Confession, page 112
 Apology, 226
 Smalcald Articles, 384
 Smaller Catechism, 421

- Larger Catechism, 519
 What baptism is, and its benefits, 112
 [226, 384, 421, 520]
 Erroneous articles of the Anabaptists,
 [112, 227, 537, 729, 730]

XIV. OF THE LORD'S SUPPER.

- Augsburg Confession, page 112, 119
 Apology, 294
 Smalcald Articles, 384
 Smaller Catechism, 424
 Larger Catechism, 531
 Epitome, 569
 Declaration, 660
 That the words of the testament of Christ are not to be understood otherwise than according to their literal sense, 571, 662
 That in the use of this holy sacrament, the words of the institution of Christ are in nowise to be omitted, but are to be publicly recited, 571, 675, 676
 That the consecration, or the minister's declaration of the words of Christ, or the work of any man, does not effect the presence of the body and blood of Christ, but this is done by the omnipotent power of Christ, 571, 675
 Why the words, *under the bread, with the bread, in the bread*, are used by us in the holy Supper, 667
 That in the sacrament of the Lord's Supper we receive with the visible bread and wine, the true body and blood of Christ, 112, 227, 384, 421, 531, 532
 That in this sacrament we receive the body of Christ not only spiritually, but also orally, 571, 669, 670, 673, 674
 That in this holy sacrament Luther understood the word spiritual otherwise than the Sacramentarians did, 681
 That this eating takes place, not in a Capernaïtic, but in a supernatural, heavenly manner, 571, 681
 That we do not receive this sacrament blissfully, *ex opere operato*, 169, 192
 [234, 267]
 That not only the worthy and truly believing, but also the unworthy and unbelieving receive the true body and blood of Christ, 384, 572, 664, 672
 That there is but one species of unworthy guests, namely, the impenitent and unbelieving, 572
 That all the worthiness of the guests of this Supper, consists in the merits of Christ alone,—which we apply to ourselves through faith, and of this application we receive the assurance through this sacrament,—and by no means in our virtues, 572
 This worthiness consists not in a strong or a weak faith, 674
 That those of weak faith do not receive this sacrament unworthily, 572, 674
 The worthiness and benefit of this sacrament does not depend upon the worthiness or unworthiness of the priest, 664
 The *grounds* of Luther concerning the presence of the body and blood of Christ in the Lord's Supper, 571, 679
 Luther's foreseeing, that after his death attempts would be made to make him appear as a sacramentarian, and his solemn indication, that he would never change his views concerning this sacrament, 666
 Why this article was introduced in the Formula of Concord, 569, 660
 Of the two different classes of Sacramentarians, 570, 661
 Summary enumeration of the errors of the Sacramentarians concerning the Lord's Supper, and the rejection of the same, 572, 574, 681, 684
 Of the one element of the Sacrament of the Papists, 294, 384, 385, 573, 682
 Of locking up and bearing about the bread in the Papistical mass, 110, 681
 Of the Papistical transubstantiation, [572, 681]

OF THE MASS.

- Augsburg Confession, page 122
 Apology, 313
 Smalcald Articles, 367
 Of the Papistical mass, 122, 313, 326
 [367, 573, 681]
 Whether a person may administer the Sacrament to himself, and thus hold mass, 368

OF SACRIFICE.

- Apology, page 313, 323
 Why God rejects the sacrifices in the Old Testament, which however he himself commanded, 315
 The ancient teachers or Fathers on the sacrifice, 323

XV. OF THINGS INDIFFERENT, OR CHURCH USAGES.

Augsburg Confession,	page 113, 126	from us, we are not to yield to the
Apology,	268	enemies of God in these indifferent
Smalcald Articles,	390	things,
Epitome,	581	Things indifferent should not be held as
Declaration,	705	divine service in themselves,
What indifferent things are,	581, 705	581, 709
That the church of God at all times has		Ceremonies shall not be obtruded upon
power to alter such ceremonies, yet		the church of God, as necessary,
so as to avoid levity and offence, sparing		contrary to her will, through con-
the weak in faith,	582, 706	straint,
That in the time of persecution, when a		399, 582, 707
firm and clear confession is required		That no church should condemn another
		on account of dissimilarity in cere-
		monies,
		222, 582, 710

XVI. OF THE CHRISTIAN CHURCH.

Augsburg Confession,	page 111	What and where the Christian church
Apology,	215	is,
Smalcald Articles,	389	111, 215, 389
Epitome,	587	That it is known by the Gospel and the
Declaration,	728	Sacraments,
That there ever shall be and continue		216
one holy Christian church,	111	That there are also hypocrites and
		wicked persons in the congregation
		of Christians,
		216, 226

OF POPERY.

Smalcald Articles,	page 372	head of the Christian church,
Whether the Pope is <i>jure divino</i> the		372
		[373, 392]

XVII. OF THE CROSSES OF CHRISTIANS.

Why Christians must be subject to various crosses and sufferings,	259, 260
---	----------

XVIII. OF PRAYER.

Smaller Catechism,	page 418, 425, 426	Explanation of the Lord's Prayer,
Larger Catechism,	500	418
		[500]

OF THE WORSHIP OF SAINTS.

Augsburg Confession,	page 118	we should render them in other re-
Apology,	285	spects,
Smalcald Articles,	371	118, 286, 341, 371
That we should not invoke the saints,		We have one Mediator between us and
and the kind of honor and service		God, who is Jesus Christ,
		287

XIX. OF THE STATE OF MATRIMONY.

Augsburg Confession,	page 120	Smaller Catechism,
Apology,	297	427,
Smalcald Articles,	388	Of matrimony, and especially of the
		marriage of priests,
		120, 297, 388

XX. OF CIVIL GOVERNMENT.

Augsburg Confession,	page 113	Larger Catechism,
Apology,	277	512
		That it is the order of God,
		277

XXI. OF THE MINISTRY AND SPIRITUAL POWER.

Augsburg Confession,	page 110, 113, 133	Smalcald Articles,
Apology,	345	388, 403
That no one should teach or preach pub-		Of consecration and vocation,
licly in the church, or administer the		388
Sacraments, unless he be regularly		Of the power and jurisdiction of bishops,
called,	113, 267	and ordination,
		133, 345, 403
		Of the liberty and privileges of the ec-
		clesiastics in Popery,
		345

XXII. OF THE RESURRECTION FROM THE DEAD, AND OF THE DAY OF JUDGMENT.

Augsburg Confession,	page 114	poral kingdom, and that all the wicked will be exterminated,	114
Apology,	280	Of eternal life, and why it is called a reward,	210
That the doctrine is false and wrong, that prior to the resurrection, the holy and pious alone will occupy a tem-			

OF HELL.

False opinion of the Anabaptists, who teach, that devils and condemned men	shall not suffer everlasting pain and torment,	114
--	--	-----

XXIII. OF CHRIST'S DESCENT INTO HELL.

Epitome,	page 580	Christ into hell took place, 580, 704
Declaration,	704	That in this article we should adhere to the explanation of Luther's, made A. D. 1533, in a sermon at Torgau,
That there should be no disputation about this article, nor should we attempt to scrutinize how the descent of		580, 704

Princeton Theological Seminary Libraries



1 1012 01260 0880

ernal life.

Anabaptism.

ctrine

oved c
innocence, (

ure."

in that the

ge, for Oh

by th

.)

